The Forum

JULY, 1896.

JEFFERSON AND HIS PARTY TO-DAY.

It is a valuable and possibly a peculiar feature in American politics that the adherents of the leading older parties love to turn back to the early founders and their work, not only to get inspiration for the future, but to justify the present.

Foreign writers comment upon the feeling—little short of worship—with which we regard the National Constitution, and the early acts and expressions which resulted in the formation of the Union. This is especially true of the Democratic party, both on account of its long history, dating from the beginning of the Federal Government, and because with all the changes and evolutions of time that party has been progressively conservative,—progressive in meeting the issues of the day, conservative in applying to them the principles taught in the past. So Democrats to-day, consulting together for the promotion of their party's interests, and as loyal Americans anxious to keep their party steadfast to their country's welfare, naturally turn their thoughts to Thomas Jefferson, whose memory they honor, and out of whose life and work were largely wrought the independence and stability of our nation and the principles and policies which have made her great and glorious.

His work was fundamental, national, establishing equality, liberty, creating a great Republic, enlarging its territory and making it supreme over a continent and respected everywhere. He founded a great party as the necessary instrument to accomplish large purposes and the permanent power to maintain and enforce undying principles. On the eve of that party's twenty-fifth Presidential campaign it is fitting for us to

Copyright, 1895, by the Forum Publishing Company.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consider his teaching, the principles he proclaimed, the conditions out of which they sprang, their application to present issues, and then the secret of his successful and powerful leadership. In the days of war, when the northern soldier going to the front passed the Old South meeting-house in Boston, he reverently raised his cap, for a voice within its homely walls spoke to him and sent him forth a braver, truer man. Democrats, now going forth to battle, may reverently pause at the tomb of Jefferson to catch the inspiration of his voice.

We remember that the party he founded has had an unbroken life of a hundred years; that it has controlled the National Government for more than one half of its duration; that it has victoriously led the people in all our foreign wars; that under its sway our national domain was extended along the Gulf and the Mississippi and clear to the Pacific slope; that it fathered the settlement of the great Northwest and the upbuilding of mighty States; that it established our flag and commerce on the sea; asserted everywhere the rights of American citizenship; and created the foreign policy which from Monroe to Cleveland has been deemed essential to our safety. It has resisted always the control of government by monopoly and organized wealth; it has given power to the people, trusted them, made their welfare its mission and their will law. It has stood for individual freedom, defending the sailor against foreign impressment, the Catholic against the proscription of bigotry, and every citizen against unnecessary burdens, restrictions, or taxation. It has preached and practised economy, exposed and denounced corruption, extravagance, and the abuse of power for selfish or personal ends. It has met, defeated, and outlived all its opponents, and is still in power and in the full strength of vigorous youth. It lives and rules because it has a living gospel, just and enduring principles, and ever work for them to do. We link its present to its past not as a reminiscence, but as an incentive, and turn to Jefferson, not as a blessed memory, but as still our leader. If "new occasions teach new duties," if "time makes ancient good uncouth," it is only to those who would "unlock the future's portal with the past's blood-rusted key," not to those who would solve present problems with principles which have been the strength, the very bulwark, of the liberty and prosperity of a free and happy people. In these days of wild theories, of schemes to misuse the power and functions of government for selfish ends, in the midst of doubt and discord within and without party lines, it surely is well for the people to turn back to the teaching of Jefferson, as the tempest-tossed mariner turns to the sun for the true reckon-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing which shall set his ship upon her course. To understand this teaching, which founded a great party, established permanent principles, and guided our Republic, let us consider briefly the conditions out of which it was evolved.

The colonial settlements were neither a crusade nor a conquest. Our forefathers—the pioneers who pushed up the James river, and the pilgrims who braved the wintry seas of Massachusetts Bay—had no lust for glory or for gold. Theirs was a better, worthier, mission. They came to work, to plant, to reap, where they might worship God with freedom of conscience, live on equality each with the other, and be subject to laws of their own making and a government of their own choice. They brought with them their traditions, religion, and institutions, but, best of all, an unconquerable Anglo-Saxon self-reliance and independence. In Jamestown and in Plymouth their simple prayer to God was that for them and their children the seed-time might be followed by the harvest. But the seed was liberty, equality, self-government, and the harvest was to be a nation of equal laws, rights, and privileges, where each might fashion his own fortune and all have protection in making the most of themselves. Emigrating at different times and from different places, with variety of creed and life, scattering along the Atlantic seaboard, living under diverse influences, yet they became a homogeneous people, but with a jealous regard for individual freedom and local self-government. Union began in the need of concerted action in commercial relations and a common defence. It strengthened in mutual suffering and sympathy in the struggle between England and France for supremacy over the continent. It was finally welded in the common resistance to the tyranny of the mother country. The pioneers of Virginia and Massachusetts had encountered like perils and had a like experience in their struggles and success. Their sons had fought the same enemy on the plains of Quebec and in the valley of the Ohio. Their leaders had together planned for the protection of their common rights and liberties. Lexington and Bunker Hill marshalled to battle a people already united under great principles and for great purposes, and for whose success they were ready to pledge, each to the other, their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

But with this unifying influence there was always present a second great policy, the right of local self-government,—the individuality of the colonies and colonists. Indeed this was an essential condition. No statesman could disregard it; no union was possible without its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recognition. It was early manifest in freedom of worship. The Puritan of New England, the Dutchman of New York, the Quaker of Pennsylvania, the Roman Catholic of Maryland, and the Huguenot of the Carolinas—all lived in peace, which by peril and mutual interests strengthened into a common fellowship, but each asserted an individual right he would never surrender. In any union freedom of worship was the first necessity. It was dependent upon and emphasized the right of local self-government. For safety there was union, for liberty, self-government; it was safety with liberty, union with self-government. So the Declaration of Independence bound the colonies each to the other by most sacred pledge, asserting mutual independence, individual autonomy, and united independence, and declaring "that these united colonies are and of right ought to be free and independent States."

Then followed the weary years of common action in a feeble Congress and of common suffering on the field of battle. Victory and independence found the colonies united, but under an unstable government with disintegrating tendencies. Then, of necessity, was evolved the Constitution "to form a more perfect union," and at the same time "to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." The colonial seed had reached republican fruition; the National Government had received its charter; and an enduring Republic, the indestructible union of indestructible States, had been established.

In the formation of the Constitution, and especially in its development under amendment and construction, there were discussion and difference of opinion over fundamental principles and the proper scope and functions of government. This was natural, necessary, and wholesome in a free and intelligent people, and led inevitably to division into parties. The very freedom of thought, speech, and action guaranteed in the early Amendments meant such result. Political opinion was not to be coerced or controlled, nor unanimity over policies or candidates to be expected. Agitation, discussion, not silence and indifference, were the "eternal vigilance" which should preserve liberty. So were evolved political parties with their policies and leaders, their duties and responsibilities. The time was ripe and the leaders were ready. Three stood foremost in public esteem, conspicuous for their services, their influence, and leadership. First came Washington, loved by a whole people whom he had led to victory, established in peace, and then governed with a devoted patriotism and impartiality which knew no party division and could not limit his influence to party lines. With the confidence of all, and just to all, he could preside

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over a discordant Cabinet and govern a divided people, but could not be a party leader. That work must fall to his subordinates. So Hamilton and Jefferson became the recognized leaders of distinct schools of political thought and of conflicting policies and parties, which each upheld with signal ability and unquestioned patriotism. To Hamilton, fond of English precedents, reluctant to trust the people, doubtful of their capacity to govern themselves, a strong government seemed a necessity for their welfare and happiness, and for the preservation of liberty and property. He would enlarge by construction the powers of the Constitution, create a centralized, paternal government, make it dominant over a dependent people rather than the subject of their sovereign will. With sincerity and singleness of purpose he sought no doubt the people's interest, but with his light he could find it only through and under a controlling power; and he looked upon them as the subjects rather than the source of government. Jefferson began at the other end. In his mind stood first the rights of the individual, next the power of the people, and then to establish both a government guaranteeing freedom and resting upon consent. The cornerstone of his party was the truths he had asserted as self-evident in the Declaration of Independence, that all men are created equal, endowed with certain inalienable rights, to secure which rights governments are instituted, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. Of necessity government was to be of limited powers and always under the control of the people. It was not to be a tyrant to destroy their rights, nor an almoner to give them livelihood. In administration it was to be "rigorously frugal and simple"; in form, self-government kept near to the power that makes and obeys it. It was to be home rule with jealous regard for the rights of the States and of local government.

With clear vision he saw the future, understood the material out of which our Republic was wrought, and so made its authority spring from the people and its function service in their interest. Rights, not favors; the people, not classes, are the watchwords to define his political belief. His Democracy rests upon an abiding trust in the people, a belief that power can safely be given them, and that the broader the foundation the safer the structure of our government. With him the Democratic party of to-day believes in perfect liberty in thought and action; in the equality of all before the law; in the freedom of the individual from unnecessary restrictions and burdens; that the powers of government are for public purposes, not private ends; that taxation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is a necessary evil, to be lessened by prudence and economy; that it is to be levied justly, equally, according to men's means, not their necessities, and is not to be used to take from one and give to another, nor to enrich the few at the expense of the many. In his creed there were only common rights, not favored interests; no privileged class, but only the greatest good of the greatest number. His Democracy stood beside the humblest individual to protect him from oppression, and was the bulwark of the silent people to prevent the power and purpose of government from being warped by the clamorous demands of selfish interests. His party was, and is, and is to be the people's party. In all of this Jefferson created no new theory of government. He merely recognized the conditions under which our country was settled and our Union formed, and under which it must continue. Upon these principles he founded an indestructible party. With variety of expression and application they have been that party's platform through all the changes and emergencies of our Republic. Let me repeat the platform as he declared it in his first inaugural address:—

"Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none; the support of the State governments in all their rights as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against anti-republican tendencies; the preservation of the General Government in its whole constitutional vigor as the sheet-anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; . . . economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened, the honest payment of our debts and the sacred preservation of the public faith; encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid; the diffusion of information and the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public opinion; freedom of religion; freedom of the press; freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus, and trial by juries impartially selected; —these principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation."

To Jefferson and his party these principles were not idle abstractions and empty platitudes, but were a political policy to be aggressively enforced in the laws of State and nation. The equality and liberty he preached he had infused into the life of his State by various laws which uprooted caste and privilege. His vigorous hand soon abolished entail and primogeniture, that there might be, as he wrote, "instead of an aristocracy of wealth . . . an aristocracy of virtue and talent, which nature has wisely provided for the direction of the interests of society and scattered with equal hand through all its conditions." He stopped the importation of slaves into Virginia, recommended

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

measures for their gradual emancipation, and drafted a plan for the government of the Northwestern Territory with a provision forbidding slavery. "Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate," he said, "than that these people are to be free." He modified the severity of the criminal law by a just and humane code. He provided for the citizenship of aliens by a system of naturalization which was generally adopted throughout the Union. Believing that "the basis of our government is the opinion of the people," and that "the very first object should be to keep that right," he made education a public duty, and devised an elaborate school system, culminating in the great university he founded. "Freedom of religion" was to him not an idle phrase, but a sacred right to be guaranteed by law. So he overthrew the established church, broke the union of state and church, and abolished what he termed "this spiritual tyranny." "Personal liberty" found in him its ready champion when violated by the Alien and Sedition laws, which he denounced as contrary to the letter and the spirit of the Constitution. He fought the United States Bank and Hamilton's plan of bounties and protection, because he believed they meant control of law by monopoly and wealth and class through corrupt influences for selfish ends—a system which he declared had been contrived "for deluging the States with paper money," withdrawing citizens from useful pursuits "to occupy them and their capital in a species of gambling destructive of morality, and which had introduced its poison into the Government itself." His Democracy taught that control of law should be only by and for the people.

But Jefferson's thought and work were not limited to domestic questions. He lived in times of revolution and war. He had been a powerful factor in achieving the independence of our country and in maintaining it against foreign aggression. He advocated and accomplished a vast extension of her territory, straining his constitutional power as he frankly admitted. He believed in the future and grand destiny of our Republic, and declared "we should have such an empire for Liberty as she has never surveyed since the creation," and that "no Constitution was ever before so well calculated as ours for extensive empire and self-government." He upheld the nation's honor, asserted its rights, and jealously guarded its interests against foreign attack, but declared her policy to be, "peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none." He held the country aloof from foreign complications which did not encroach upon her rights; vigorously protested when they reached this point, but was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

desirous ever of peace with honor. In the early years of the conflict between England and France he wrote as Secretary of State: "I wish we may be able to repress the spirit of the people within the limits of a fair neutrality." Later, when England planned to seize Spain's North American possessions, he formulated the principle of the Monroe doctrine in his instructions as President to our minister at her court. He wrote:—

"We wish you, therefore, to intimate to them [the British ministry] that we cannot be indifferent to enterprises of this kind; that we should contemplate a change of neighbors with extreme uneasiness; that a due balance on our borders is not less desirable to us than a balance of power in Europe has always appeared to them."

And later still he said with all sincerity:—

"No two countries upon earth have so many points of common interest and friendship, and their rulers must be great bunglers indeed if, with such dispositions, they break them asunder."

He believed that the honor and safety of our country lay in "fair neutrality," peace and "honest friendship with all nations," but with recognition of her continental interests and readiness to assert her power in their defence. In the young life of a new Republic he established the foreign policy since followed in her full maturity and invincible strength, and which finds its latest expression in the vigorous action of a Democratic Administration. His pen might have written, as no doubt his teaching suggested, the declaration:—

". . . that while it is a grievous thing to contemplate the two great English-speaking peoples of the world as being otherwise than friendly competitors in the onward march of civilization, and strenuous and worthy rivals in all the arts of peace, there is no calamity which a great nation can invite which equals that which follows a supine submission to wrong and injustice, and the consequent loss of national self-respect and honor, beneath which are shielded and defended a people's safety and greatness."

He would rejoice with us that out of friction and discord, with self-respect and honor, is coming the closer union of the Anglo-Saxon race on the firm basis of peace and arbitration. He would counsel us to a "vigorous prosecution of the pursuits of peace," and not to follow the bloody footsteps of other nations into the field of conquest and annexation, of strife and war.

I have spoken of Jefferson as if he were with us. May the Democrats feel his presence and hear his voice. Let them summon him to their council board to teach, unite, and lead them as they go forth to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

battle. What would they say to him of the present, its parties, its issues, and the questions before the people? Speaking broadly, they could truthfully say that present issues involve the old contest over the proper power and functions of government, the old issue between the use of that power for public purposes and its use for class, or sectional, or private interests, and that the great party he founded has need to assert the principles he proclaimed.

It finds as its opponent a party which was born of a great agitation for a worthy mission now long accomplished; that since, that party has been drifting with no fixed principles or purpose, but the prey of selfish interests which demand in return for their support legislation for their benefit; that firmly established in power it yielded to corruption which in successive revolts drove from it its old leaders and much of its conscience vote; that for nearly a generation it has sought success through stirring up sectional prejudice and hatred among a people reunited in love and loyalty; that it fosters now within its ranks a faction that would divide us on race and religious lines and substitute for freedom of conscience proscriptive bigotry; that it has used the nation's power to invade the rights of the States and its appropriations to supplant their duties; that repudiating its early professions, it has maintained and increased a war taxation of the people, and not for revenue, but for special, selfish interests; that it has won elections through their support and then paid for them with bounties and protective taxes out of the people's pockets; that now within its ranks it is discussing the question whether such bargain is corrupt in determining its candidate, and yet honorable in aiding his election; that it is now considering the union of two special interests—silver and protection—which if successful means impairment of the nation's credit and a greater burden on her people; that its recent policy in power, since twice repudiated by an indignant and injured people, has squandered a great surplus, instituted an era of wild extravagance, and set a precedent for national profligacy; that throughout its career it has made spoils of the public service, using both the people's offices and their laws to further partisan success rather than for public purposes. And now that party on the most important question of the day finds its leaders halting, silent, drifting, not guiding, waiting for the chance breeze to move them onward, and not ready to take the helm and set their party ship upon a course.

Who doubts where Jefferson would stand in a contest with such a party over present issues?

He would find that the Democratic party, true to his teaching, was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

still the broad, national, people's party. That it knew no South or North or East or West, but only the whole nation, whose States it has protected in their rights, and whose people it has bound together in "a more perfect union"; that it has upheld freedom of conscience and personal liberty, and has fought every proscriptive movement of class, of race, or of religion; that through a long agitation and a struggle within its ranks, it has asserted that taxation is to be only for revenue and public purposes. To this end, upon the emphatic demand of the country, it has reversed her war tariff policy. This it has done conservatively, and on the broad lines of first cheapening the necessaries of life and freeing the raw materials of industries. It has not sought to reach the goal by one effort, but step by step, with all the aid experience can give. It now demands a fair test of its law. It vigorously opposes any reaction or return to a tariff policy defeated and discarded, and recognizes the right of business interests to a period of rest. It firmly believes in the separation of government and taxation from the control of private interests and selfish influences, and confidently expects that the history of 1846 and 1857 will be repeated, and, through discussion and education, we shall, with the hearty approval of the country, return to the sound principles and tariff policy of the days before the war. Yes, and to the principle declared by Jefferson in his first message—"agriculture, manufactures, commerce, and navigation, the four pillars of our prosperity, are the most thriving when left most free to individual enterprise."

Jefferson if with us would find also to his satisfaction that his party, through the work of a courageous and patriotic Administration, had lifted the civil service above partisanship, had made its officers servants of the people, not political combatants, and by a practical and wholesome reform had placed it upon a broad and just basis. What is more democratic than to break down the barrier which excludes from public service half the people because of honest political convictions, and to open that service to any one who can meet the tests he prescribed: "Is he honest? Is he capable? Is he faithful to the Constitution?"

One further question remains, for whose solution Democrats turn to Jefferson for help and guidance. We are in the midst of an earnest agitation over our monetary standard. The agitation crosses party lines and tends to geographical division. It involves the welfare of our country and demands explicit and courageous treatment. To Jefferson it could never be an issue between Colorado and Wall Street, or between a debtor and a creditor class. His broad Democracy abhorred

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

geographical and class division. With true patriotism he would ask, Where lie the honor and credit of our common country? Where rest the interests of our whole people? For one I believe that our country's honor demands scrupulous fidelity to her plighted word, honest payment of her obligations, and that the people's interest is best served by strictly upholding here the gold standard of the civilized world. Free coinage of silver, or its compulsory purchase, or any compromise legislation by us in that direction, in my judgment, is distinctly class legislation, which would unsettle business, impair credit, reduce all savings and the value of all wages, and whose injurious results no man can measure. I have misunderstood the teaching of Jefferson and the traditions and principles of his party if they do not support this view and sustain a Democratic Administration in its resolute enforcement of it. With Jefferson truth never lay in compromise of principle, nor success in evasion of responsibility. Nor will they with us. Let Democrats leave compromise and expediency to the Republican party, which is ever ready to trim and evade, to harmonize its warring factions. Let us, if need be, through discussion and agitation, find the truth, bravely assert it, and trust our cause to the conscience and patriotism of the people.

The secret of Jefferson's power and leadership was his steadfastness to principle. With firm belief in popular government, he trusted the intelligence of the people to correct passing errors and to establish safe and sound policies. Well has it been said of him that "he never in any stress deserted or even temporarily disavowed his principles. He never lost faith or courage. He did not trim his sails to every flaw on the political ocean, but waited through the longest unpromising days, with a noble patience, the powerful and steady gale which he was convinced would in time carry the nation upon her true course." His courage, his faith, his resolute leadership, have guided the latest, as they did the first of the Democratic Administrations, which with vigor and patriotism have made dominant the wishes, the rights, and the welfare of the whole people. Whatever the storm, whatever the gusts of passion or of prejudice, however threatening the clouds of panic and disaster which have hung over all nations, our President has kept the rudder true. To no political flaw has he trimmed sail, in no stress has he lost courage or abandoned principle. There is inspiration in the leadership of Jefferson and Cleveland. It nerves us to stand fast to principle, to put aside expediency and compromise, and with courage and fidelity to meet all pending issues. So shall Democracy merit and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

win success, and hold the confidence of the country as it has in the past. It need not fear defeat. It met it in '88 and then went forth united and strengthened to triumphant victory. It should fear the discredit of sacrificing principle to expediency, or of turning aside from the safe course which Jefferson established. Let our good Democratic ship avoid the passing flaws which would drift her hither and thither, content to wait "the powerful and steady gale which will carry the nation upon her true course."

WILLIAM E. RUSSELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PRESIDENTIAL OUTLOOK.

I.

In Europe, those who are interested in international questions, and particularly in American affairs and their possible influence, follow the preparations for the Presidential election in the United States with some anxiety. They do not pretend to form an opinion as to the situation of the respective political parties, or as to their strength; nor do these things concern them. But they cannot be blind to great international economic problems or to the manner in which these may be affected by the triumph of one or another candidate.

Until within a score of years, the relations of the continent of Europe with the United States were almost solely commercial; the question of the customs tariff was the only one that had a direct interest for continental Europe in its relations with North America. For nearly a quarter of a century now, the French, Belgians, Dutch, and the Germans, following the English, have come to regard the United States as a broad field for the use of their abounding capital. Open the chief economic or financial journals of France, Belgium, Holland, and Germany and you find reported and discussed the prices of the securities of your principal railways, of your various important cities, and even, at times, not only the securities but the shares of a number of your industrial corporations.

It may be said that the capital of the continent of Europe, added to English capital, in indirectly establishing a goodly number of North American enterprises, has contributed not a little to the reduction of the interest rate and to the expansion of affairs generally in the great Republic. Its influx may take on far vaster proportions in the future. If certain simple measures were adopted to put the securities of the more solid American enterprises within the reach not only of the great capitalists of Europe, but of those also of small or moderate means, the flow of European capital toward the United States might be expected to become intense as well as regular. In western Europe, in fact, the compact legion of money-savers are on the watch for all sure investments yielding 3½ per cent to 4 per cent. France, alone, within the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

last ten years, has loaned to the Russian Government and invested in various Russian enterprises, some five or six milliards of francs or more than $1,000,000,000; and to-day it may be said that the extensive empire of Russia in Asia as well as in Europe is being developed and cultivated by French and Belgian capital.

If special political sympathies and a community of international interest have turned toward Russia a large part of the small or moderate savings of France, it is none the less a fact that the more important capitalists, the educated and instructed class of the same country, have made considerable investments in American securities and are quite inclined to extend them. Little by little their example might affect the deeper strata of the population. This would be a distinct advantage both for Europe and for America. The small savings of the Old World would get from these investments a return that, even if it were not more than 3½ per cent or 3¾ per cent, would be remunerative. On their part, the United States, with so much undeveloped territory and resources of every sort, would find their progressive march quickened by this afflux of capital. The brilliant destiny of a people at once so energetic and inventive, and with such wide room for expansion, is plain to all; but the development of this destiny may be rapid or slow, and may suffer periods, shorter or longer, of check or of shock.

If the policy of the United States as to great economic questions is clearly conformed to the rules of experience and the ideas of enlightened and disinterested men, if it inspires confidence at home and abroad, the end of the nineteenth century will worthily crown a period of progress previously unheard of. In the contrary event it is to be feared that the closing years of the nineteenth century will be marked by a crisis more acute than all that we have witnessed since 1870.

This is the point of view of a European observer who, without the slightest interest in local conflicts or personal rivalries, seeks only those political conditions that will promote the welfare and progress of the United States in particular and of civilized humanity in general.

Among the aspirants for the Presidency there is one whose success would cause keen anxiety,—Major McKinley. For a number of years his name represented in Europe the most exaggerated form of protectionism, and more recently it is equally linked with bimetallism. Now excessive protectionism and the notion of giving to silver the same monetary power as to gold are, in the domain of economics, the two perils that threaten contemporary civilization.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II.

As to the first point, I shall be brief. If, under the lead of Mr. McKinley, the United States increase decidedly the import duties on European merchandise, it will unquestionably give a strong stimulus to European protectionism. In almost all the countries of Europe, the protectionist party is still very strong. High as the actual duties are they do not satisfy its appetite. In France it is agitating for a duty on wheat of ten francs (nearly $2) per metric quintal instead of seven francs or $1.40, and for like advances on other products. In Germany the "agrarians" are still ardently opposing the recent treaties of commerce. In Belgium, the Catholic party, now in power, has greater need of the rural vote than has the Liberal party, whose chances for any near return to office are feeble. Even in England there is being built up a protectionist party, though it conceals its game; just now its mask is the project for a customs union for the British Empire, involving favors for English products in the colonies and for colonial products in England.

The only restraint on the tendency of the protectionist party in Europe to new excesses is the opposition of manufacturers for export. The fear of seeing foreign markets closed against them binds these in a common effort to bridle the energies of the land-owners and land-cultivators. But if the United States led the way in the marked increase of duties, the European manufacturers would lose their chief argument in opposition to the extreme protectionists. The example of the United States would be invoked with certainty and success for an increase in the protective tariffs of Europe, particularly on agricultural products; the present rates of taxation would be augmented by 30 per cent or 40 per cent. No one can deny that this would check the progress of the United States. Immigration and railroad traffic have an intimate connection with agriculture and agricultural exports. Even manufactures cannot extend rapidly except as population increases, and such increase is incompatible with a decided falling off in the trade of Europe and America.

From the first point of view,—the revival of the protectionist régime throughout the world,—the election of Mr. McKinley must be considered as certain to cause a recoil in the development of the civilized world.

III.

The peril is no less—it is, indeed, more definite, perhaps, and more immediate—from the monetary point of view.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One of the causes impeding the flow of capital from Europe to America is the uncertainty as to the future of the American monetary system. Enlightened Europeans do not believe that the United States will commit the folly of what is called "rehabilitating silver," that is, giving it legally a monetary value double its commercial value. For some time, however, their confidence has been a little shaken. As for the capitalists of small or moderate means, all this noise about the silver question in the United States frightens them; they no longer dare to place their savings in that country.

Every one in Europe is sure that England will never abandon the pound sterling: whatever may be the coquettings of Mr. Balfour with the bimetallists, it is known that they will end in nothing positive. For this reason the pound sterling the world over is the money *par excellence*. All borrowers make their contracts in pounds sterling—Egypt, Turkey, Russia, South America. The capitalists of Europe make no investments in securities not thus formulated. The stipulation to pay in pounds sterling, or at least in gold, has become an indispensable clause in all international engagements.

Mr. McKinley passes for a partisan of silver. His election would appear as a triumph of bimetallism. Now it must plainly be said that bimetallism is in growing disfavor among clear-seeing and reflecting people. The reëstablishment of bimetallism, if it could be brought about, would plunge all civilized nations into one of those profound monetary crises that throw exchange and production into confusion for a long series of years. Even without effective result, governmental efforts, either isolated or international, to reëstablish bimetallism, to "rehabilitate silver," would interfere with all operations and disturb all legitimate interests.

Good money, solid money, with a value equal to the commercial value of the metal it is made of,—that is the first need of a civilized community, particularly of a progressive and inventive community where division of labor is advanced and where contracts for a long term of years are numerous. A patriarchal or primitive society, with stationary production, limited exchanges, and a low development of enterprise, suffers less from monetary instability; but the complex organism of a modern society, if it does not succumb to such an evil, is profoundly shaken by it.

Here is a folly very hard to understand: That in the year 1896, twenty years after the chief civilized nations have adopted—either by law, as Germany, or in practice, as France and Belgium,—the single

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gold standard to govern their exchanges; when nations that are pursuing the reform of their finances—Austria, for instance, and Russia—are employing their resources to create once more a metallic currency on a gold basis;—that it should be proposed to despise all the facts of the last quarter of a century's experience, and give to silver, a metal depreciated by increased production, a legal-tender quality equal to that of gold.

In the present state of things, after the experience gained, bimetallism would be nothing but falsification of money. There are several ways of doing that. The old way, now out of fashion, was that of the kings of the Middle Ages, notably of Philippe le Bel. It consisted in reducing the weight and keeping the nominal value of the coin—a coarse attempt at the daily cheating of the people, who soon saw the fraud and revolted with curses against the kings. It was not without justice that Dante made a place for these in his Inferno.

The world of to-day witnesses other ways, more refined, more subtle in appearance, but not less shameless and pernicious. The most widely adopted, as in most of the South American countries and in a number of those of southern Europe, consists in replacing metallic money by notes which the state issues, or causes to be issued, in arbitrary amounts. That is falsifying money—there is only a difference of method between it and that of the Middle Ages. The credit of states adopting it is injured, their public funds are depreciated. No one has any confidence in the engagements they make; no long contracts can be made with their people; or, at best, minute and often useless precautions must be taken which render operations very risky.

Bimetallism, in the present state of things, would be another way of falsifying money, and would have the same sort of consequences. It is proved that silver has lost about 45 per cent of its former value. Silver has been quoted in London for the past three years at from 30 pence to 33 pence instead of 60.8 pence, which represents the ratio of 15½ to 1 formerly adopted in Europe by the Latin Union. A mass of silver bullion, equivalent to 500 or 600 millions of francs ($100,000,000 to $120,000,000) market value, has poured out every year since 1893 at this price of 30 pence to 33 pence, and the production of silver does not lessen,—proof sufficient that this is its real value. And now—when it is shown, in the most irresistible fashion, that silver is not worth more than half what it was worth a quarter of a century ago,—its value as money is to be doubled by law! That would be—it cannot be too often repeated—falsifying money in the broadest sense of the word.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If Mr. McKinley favors this policy, that is enough to make men of foresight dread his success as a public calamity.

It must be recognized, moreover, that the present moment is more ill-chosen than ever before for seeking the reëstablishment of bimetallism. In the earlier days of silver depreciation there might be some doubts as to its cause. At least those who were imperfectly acquainted with the facts might attribute it to demonetization by Germany and to the sale of the German thalers. Even from 1880 to 1887 or 1888, there was room for fear that the production of gold might continue limited, and that, in the long run, from this cause there might be currency contraction. To-day no such pretexts avail to justify the arbitrary advance of the value of silver or an effort to restore to it the monetary part it has lost definitively among all civilized nations. It is known now that the chief cause of the fall in silver is the colossal increase in its production and the marked reduction in the cost of producing it. On the other hand any country with sound finances, and well managed, need not fear any lack of gold; since the annual output is now and will continue to be more than a milliard of francs ($200,000,000). The only nations exposed to any scarcity of gold are either those whose finances are detestable, like most of the South American countries and some of those of southern Europe, or those who, with all the germs of prosperity, like the United States, commit the blunder of not adopting an enlightened and stable financial policy and of disturbing the world by continually coquetting with bimetallism.

If the United States distinctly and definitively adopted the single gold standard, one great cause of uneasiness and disquietude would vanish, and exchanges between all the nations of the world, a secure basis being thus obtained, would take an enormous extension. The United States, at present the most active and ingenious of civilized nations, would gain most by this consolidation of universal currency,—the advantage of universal confidence.

The value of silver, moreover, it must be noted, has become most stable since governments—that of the United States particularly—have ceased to meddle with it. It is now three years since the "Sherman act" was repealed. At no time has the value of silver varied less than in these three years. While formerly it often oscillated from 15 per cent to 20 per cent it remains to-day generally near 32 pence. In consequence, the relations between the gold-standard countries and the silver-standard countries have never had a steadier basis than since 1893,—that is to say, since the repeal of the "Sherman act," and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cessation of governmental meddling in the hope of influencing the price of silver.

This fact is of the highest importance. Since arbitrary governmental action has ceased, since silver purchases are stopped, since no one any longer, in fact, believes in bimetallism, the value of silver has found a level, if not absolutely constant, at least very slightly variable. That proves the entire falsity of the bimetallist proposition. Now that it is reduced to its commercial value, silver fluctuates less than when governments were striving to sustain its price artificially.

IV.

If Mr. McKinley attains the Presidency of the United States he may be able to disturb his country, to break up the steady current of its business, to bring on a credit crisis; but it must not be thought that he would have the slightest chance of securing an international agreement for the restoration of bimetallism.

The obstacles to such an agreement are much more numerous and more insurmountable than they were five years or ten years ago. To begin with, the mere lapse of time since silver lost its monetary equality with gold renders its "rehabilitation" more difficult. It is harder to restore a régime overthrown twenty years ago, than one that fell five or six years ago. Now, it is more than twenty years since silver lost its monetary rôle in Europe. The progressive fall of silver is a second source of difficulty. When it had lost but 10 per cent or 15 per cent of its former value, it was conceivable that the effort needed to raise it from that fall might not be insurmountable. Is that conceivable when it has lost 45 per cent? When the suspension of silver coinage by the Latin Union dated back only a few years, it seemed quite easy to reopen the mints. To-day that would require something like a revolution.

Moreover, a few years since, Germany was the only country that had officially adopted the single gold standard; now Austria-Hungary is in the same case. During the last half dozen years it has considerably advanced a carefully conceived and well managed plan to put its currency on a gold basis. Is it credible that the fruits of all these efforts and sacrifices will be surrendered?

The immense empire of Russia is doing the same work. Every one knows that the chief aim of its policy since the restoration of its finances has been the resumption of specie payments on a gold basis. Russia is vigilantly collecting all the gold accessible, and it is known that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the greater part of this metal that has left the United States during the past two years has found refuge in the vaults of the Imperial Bank or in those of the Russian Treasury. At this moment the Imperial Bank of Russia has the largest gold reserve in the whole world. At the end of the first quarter of 1896, the gold reserve of this bank amounted to two milliards one hundred and thirty millions of francs (about $420,000,000), exceeding by one hundred and eighty millions the gold stock of the Bank of France, which amounted to one thousand nine hundred and fifty one millions of francs (approximately $384,000,000). All European financiers know that the Russian Government is effecting the change to the single gold standard. It has already taken a number of preparatory steps—for instance, a recent ukase legalized agreements between private citizens or corporations to pay in gold. The Scandinavian countries, small in population but admirably managed, long since adopted the single gold standard.

Can we believe that Russia, with a government of rare persistence and tenacity, after having gathered such resources and taken such legal steps for the resumption of specie payments on a gold basis, will throw up its plans and adopt bimetallism? That belief would show but little comprehension of this silent government, unfalteringly faithful to schemes once formed.

Another equally insurmountable obstacle to the attainment of international bimetallism is the existence of a mass of new state debts payable in gold. All the Russian loans issued in France—and there are at least a half dozen milliards of francs of them (about $1,200,000,000)—are expressly payable in gold. The Austro-Hungarian loans are the same; so are the loans of various less important nations. These are engagements, precise, recent, numerous, that in effect absolutely exclude bimetallism.

The attitude of the different European countries is absolutely discouraging for the partisans of bimetallism. In England the leaders of the Conservative party, except Mr. Balfour, join the leaders of the Liberal party in declaring that her actual monetary system is one of the national forces of Great Britain. As for Mr. Balfour, he is known as a virtuoso attached but lightly to his ideas. It is his fashion to flatter certain doctrines when he is in opposition and when in power to say that it does not lie with him to carry them out.

In France an analogous spectacle is offered. Our premier—M. Méline—is the leader of the protectionists and bimetallists of France. The other day he attended, with the minister of commerce, a banquet

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

given by the Bimetallic League. In response to a toast, he declared that all his sympathies were with the principle of the League, but that its success depended on the conversion of England to this principle. The ministers in France have very little power, being but ephemeral personages. Moreover the situation of parties and the play of the governmental mechanism render it very difficult in France, and almost impossible to obtain a vote for an important measure which would work a great change. Apart from these facts, it is plain from M. Méline's own declaration that it would be sheer folly to expect anything but empty words from the French ministry in this matter.

Bimetallism in Europe, then, is absolutely a lost cause. Mr. McKinley, if he were elected President, could not give back life to a doctrine abandoned of men, and which is buried under a quarter of a century of the gold régime. But Mr. McKinley, notwithstanding, could produce much agitation and trouble. He could abolish confidence in American investments and disturb all business with America. Would it not be an amazing affliction to see the nineteenth century close with this contrast: the great Republic of the United States making the blunder of chaining itself to the silver standard while not only all Europe but the immense empire of Russia, one half Asiatic, is on the eve of adopting the single gold standard?

PAUL LEROY-BEAULIEU.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REASONS FOR AN IMMEDIATE ARBITRATION TREATY WITH ENGLAND.[1]

I COULD not bring to the recent Arbitration Conference at Washington, like several of the earlier speakers, a learned essay on international law; but was obliged to speak without adequate preparation, as a plain American citizen who thinks about public problems, who has read some history of his own and other countries, and who loves his country.

Ex-Senator Edmunds, in introducing me to the audience at the last session of the Conference, reminded me that I could not help speaking in some sense for an ancient institution of our land—Harvard University. I was, therefore, led to say, in the first place, that Harvard University has as little reason as any institution in our country to feel an irrational or exaggerated dread of war. It has survived many wars—Indian, French, and English. Ever since the early days when the Puritan meeting-houses had to be fortified, and all males over sixteen were required to carry their guns and ammunition to meeting, the graduates of Harvard University have been taking part in war after war, till we come down to the twelve hundred graduates and students who entered the army and navy of the United States in the civil war. The chief building of the University commemorates one hundred and fifty Harvard men who laid down their lives for the country in that war alone. When Lord Percy marched to reinforce Major Pitcairn, retreating from Lexington, his column passed by the college gate. When the little band of raw militia, who were to throw up intrenchments on Bunker Hill, were paraded on the green north of the College building, on the evening before the battle, the President of Harvard College offered prayer before them, as for men going into deadly peril in a righteous cause. The British army was within three miles. The leading patriots of that day, in Boston and Cambridge, took in their hands "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor." All the buildings of Harvard College were occupied for months by the patriot

[1] The substance of this paper was contained in a speech by President Eliot at the Arbitration Conference held at Washington in April last.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

army besieging Boston. The Corporation of the College, which is working to-day under the charter given in 1650, has been through crisis after crisis,—industrial, financial, and agricultural,—always trying to preserve the precious funds given for the promotion of learning. Panics, crises, or periods of financial and industrial disturbance supervene invariably upon war. Many and many a one has the College passed through.

In two hundred and sixty years we have had full experience of war, and its consequences to the institutions of education and religion; and yet Harvard University knows full well by its own observation and experience, that heroic virtue may be plucked by noble souls from out the desolation, carnage, and agony of war. We know, too, that even from unjust war, like that with Mexico, a nation may win advantages real and permanent, though undeserved. Therefore, when we plead for arbitration, we do not necessarily deny that war has a greatness of its own, and that out of it may sometimes come permanent gain for the moral forces of human society; but we do maintain that the deliberate bringing about of war through a belligerent public policy can only be compared to the deliberate and intentional introduction of a pestilence into a crowded city, in order, forsooth, that thousands of victims may have opportunity to suffer and die with patience, and that some noble souls—nurses, doctors, and mothers—may have opportunity to develop and display heroic qualities. The one operation would be just as reasonable as the other. Never ought we to hear it maintained in our country that war should be deliberately provoked and brought about, in order that the nation may develop in a few souls the noble qualities which give victory over loss, pain, and death.

And what shall we say about careless inattention to those insidious or hidden sources of national exasperation which, in their development, may produce war? I believe that it was a just apprehension about such carelessness, such inattention to the tendencies of a public policy that may lead to war, which brought the Arbitration Conference together. It was lately asserted in a public print, presumably by its editor, a Harvard graduate,—for every possible opinion is developed among the graduates of that populous institution,—that the Conference was to be held at an inopportune moment. It seems to me, on the contrary, that the moment for the meeting of the Conference was well chosen.

Why was it summoned to meet three months ago? It was, I believe, because its members, like other thoughtful American citizens,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had been surprised and shocked at the risk of war which the country had lately incurred. Only six months ago, a message of the President of the United States seemed to thousands of sober-minded men in this and other countries to contain a grave threat of war, in case a boundary question between two other nations should fail of settlement by arbitration and our own uninvited decision of it should be rejected. Shortly after, we learned with astonishment that, months before, the Secretary of State had issued papers of a tenor which, in a contest between two individuals, would fairly have been called exasperating. All men know that the peaceful settlement of a controversy between two self-confident and strong men is not promoted, if one says to the other—"My fiat shall be law between us."

Such views, conveyed in public documents, took thousands of thoughtful Americans by surprise. The surprise, and the shock to public opinion, were, I dare say, unforeseen and unintended; but they were inevitable from the tone of the papers.

Then we had another surprise. We have thought that the separation of the executive and legislative functions in our Republic had one great advantage, on which we might rely,—namely, that when executive propositions of a serious nature were laid before the legislative branches those branches might be depended upon to take time for consideration, and so to procure delay. We have been painfully surprised to learn by the actual event that such reliance is not well founded.

Moreover, we have had brought forcibly to our notice a phenomenon new in our country, and perhaps in the world,—namely, the formidable inflammability of our multitudinous population, in consequence of the recent development of telegraph, telephone, and bi-daily press. I think those words fairly describe the phenomenon of six months ago—our population is more inflammable than it used to be, because of the increased use in comparatively recent years of these great inventions.

Still another disquieting fact has been forced on our attention. Quite within recent years, it has become the practice to employ as Cabinet officers men who have not had legislative experience, or experience in any branch of the Government, before assuming these important functions. One reason for this new practice is, that senatorships are much more attractive than Cabinet offices. But, be the reason what it may, this recent practice has introduced into our governmental system a new and serious danger,—the danger of inexperience in high

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

places, the danger of bringing into great public functions men suddenly taken from business, or from the controversial profession of the law.

Besides these revelations of the last six months, there is another inducement for thoughtful Americans to interest themselves in all the means of interposing obstacles to sudden movements toward war. We have heard during the last eight or ten years from both political parties, and perhaps as much from the one as from the other, the advocacy of a policy entirely new among us, absolutely repugnant to all American diplomatic doctrines, and imported straight from the aristocratic and military nations of Europe. I refer, of course, to this recent doctrine called "jingoism"—a detestable word for a detestable thing. I should be at a loss to state which party in this country has been most guilty of this monstrous teaching; and if inquired of by some reader with a good memory, I should be obliged in honesty to confess that among the worst offenders in this respect are to be found several eminent graduates of Harvard University. What can be clearer than that this doctrine is an offensive foreign importation, against which, unfortunately, our protective legislation has proved an inadequate defence? The very term is of English origin, and is taken not from the best side of English politics, but from the worst,—from the politics of Palmerston and Disraeli, and not of Bright, Gladstone, Hartington, and Balfour. It is the most abject copy conceivable of a pernicious foreign idea; and yet some of our public men endeavor to pass it off among our people as American patriotism. A more complete delusion, a falser representation, cannot be imagined. The whole history of the American people runs directly counter to this European notion. Our nation has always advocated the rights of neutrals, arbitration, and the peaceful settlement of international disputes. It has contributed more than any other nation to the development of successful methods of arbitration. It has contributed more than any other nation to the promotion of peace and the avoidance of great armaments. There has never been a wiser or more beneficent agreement between two powerful neighbors than the simple convention, made between the United States and Canada nearly eighty years ago, to the effect that nothing but a small marine police force should be kept on the great lakes. What other powerful nation has dispensed with a standing army? What other nation with an immense seaboard has maintained but an insignificant fleet? It has been our glory to be safe, though without fortresses, fleets, or armies.

Can anything be more offensive to the sober-minded, self-respecting, laborious classes of American society, than this doctrine of jingoism,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this chip-on-the-shoulder attitude, this language of the ruffian and the bully? This is just what jingoism means in its native soil, where it is coupled with a brutal and insolent militarism, natural enough to countries where the government has been despotic or aristocratic and the military class has been enormous, but absolutely foreign to American society.

The teaching of this doctrine by our press and some of our public men is one of the reasons why the Arbitration Conference came together. Its members want to teach just the opposite doctrine. They want to set forth in the daily and periodical press, and by publications of their own, what the true American doctrine on international relations really is. They want to have the children of this country, the young men who are rising up into places of authority and influence, taught what the true American doctrine of peace has been, and what the true reliance of a great, strong, free nation should be—not the force of arms, but the force of righteousness. The moment is opportune for the inculcation of these doctrines. We have escaped a serious danger, but thoughtful men should say: "We will now make such preparation as will give us a new security for peace,—namely, the preconcerted, prearranged security of a treaty of arbitration." This it is which the Conference came together to support, maintain, and inculcate as the duty and the privilege of the American people.

I can hardly conceive that any person who has read the history of our country should arrive at any other conclusion with regard to its natural mission; and yet, in this very Arbitration Conference, one gentleman arose to say that we had a mission to carry our political ideas over the world, to spread the knowledge of our free institutions and our methods of self-government among the peoples of the earth; and that, like England, we should execute this mission by ships and guns, and, like her, should fortify our seaboard to resist aggression. A propaganda of armed force was recommended to carry over the world the public principles of liberty for which our nation stands.

I, too, believe that this nation has a mission in the world, a noble mission; but not one to be executed in that fashion. It is not by force of arms that we may best commend to the peoples of the earth the blessings of liberty and self-government; but rather by taking millions from various peoples into our own land, and here giving them experience of the advantages of freedom. Have we not done that? Eighteen million strong they have come across the seas since 1846. All of us have come within three hundred years; and this great nation has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

grown up on this continental territory, believing in and practising the principles of self-government, freedom, and peace. There is only one other means by which we should teach these principles to men. It is by example,—by giving a persuasive example of happiness and prosperity, arrived at through living in freedom and at peace. Never should we advocate the extension of our institutions by force of arms, either on sea or on land. Never should we attempt to force another nation to adopt arbitration or any other method of peace.

I believe that in all our public schools and all our colleges the principles I have just stated should be taught as the true American doctrine on this subject. One speaker at the Conference mentioned a special subject in which he thought instruction should be given throughout our land. He said: "We have been taught in our schools about the battles of the nation. We have not been taught about the arbitrations of our nation." Let us teach the children what is the rational, sober-minded, righteous mode of settling international difficulties. Let us teach them that war often fails to settle disputes, while arbitration always leads to definitive settlement. Let us teach them that what is reasonable and righteous between man and man is also reasonable and righteous between nation and nation.

CHARLES W. ELIOT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR. CLEVELAND'S SECOND ADMINISTRATION.

MR. CLEVELAND was chosen to the Presidency for the second time on the issue which he had given to the country four years previous. Defeated in 1888, though with a plurality of the popular vote in his favor, in 1892, in response to an overwhelming popular demand, in the teeth of the bitter opposition of the whole delegation from his own State, he was nominated for the third time, and elected by an extraordinary majority in the Electoral College, and nearly 400,000 plurality of the popular vote. He gave to Democracy, on the issue which he had set before the country in the crisp and ringing phrases of his tariff message in December, 1887, the most decisive victory it ever won, and carried with him a substantial party majority in both Senate and House. To-day, on the eve of another national election as his second term draws to a close, his party is no longer in control of the Senate; the great Democratic majority has been replaced by a still greater Republican majority in the House; yet the President is still the first man in the estimation of his party, while he commands the respect and admiration of the country at large.

A review of some of the most important events of his Administration, necessarily incomplete and brief as the limits of such an article require, may throw light on this curious situation.

I.

At the end of the last Republican Administration the Treasury was in distress. The gold reserve had fallen to the danger point; extravagant appropriations by the Republican Congress of an unprecedented amount had eaten up the $100,000,000 surplus of the preceding Democratic Administration; the available cash balance had dropped from $163,000,000 to $11,000,000, and the head of the Treasury Department had to declare that an issue of bonds, under the Act of 1875, was necessary in order to buy more gold, though both he and the Republican President shirked that responsibility and left it for the incoming President to shoulder, while they watched the outflow of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Treasury gold from day to day, hoping only to tide matters over until March 4.

An analysis of Mr. Foster's final report in February, 1893, suggests either fatuous ignorance or culpable bad faith. "I have great satisfaction in being able to say that the general conditions affecting the commercial and industrial interests of the United States are in the highest degree favorable," were his words at the very moment when his own figures showed that his claim of an apparent surplus of only $2,000,000 was offset by contracts to the amount of $6,000,000 called for by Congressional appropriations, and revealed a net loss of revenue, compared with 1891, of more than $42,000,000 in customs duties alone under the McKinley Act then in operation. The situation was critical. The new Administration was face to face with the question which, as Mr. Lecky in his recent book[1] says, is the most serious one for a commercial people to determine,—whether or not we should have any standard of value at all. Without recognizing the danger, or even admitting the fact, we had been drifting away from the gold standard toward a silver basis.

Mr. Cleveland did not yield to the pressing demands for an immediate extra session of Congress.[2] He quietly gave the country time to comprehend the situation, recognize the specific evil, and so gave public opinion a chance to crystallize in support of his effort for remedial legislation. Time did its beneficent work. Even the New York "Tribune," which at first was doubtful "whether the naked repeal of the Sherman Act would be for the best interests of the country," had come to see, by June, 1893, that "the repeal of the Act with which Senator Sherman's name is unfortunately associated is imperatively demanded." Gov. McKinley, with no padlock upon his lips at the time, found it easy to decry the Democratic President. The suggestion of a remedy, or even the disclosure of his own views upon the subject, he carefully avoided with characteristic evasion.

[1] "Democracy and Liberty." By W. E. H. Lecky. 2 vols. N. Y.: Longmans, Green & Co.

[2] The action he meant to take was well understood. Before the Convention of 1892, when he was sounded by the silver Democrats who offered to support him if he would simply refrain from any expression of opinion on the subject, he assured Mr. Schurz, in an interview to which I am allowed by the latter to refer, that "he would declare himself on the money question, whatever political consequences it might have as to his own future." This was followed soon after by the famous letter giving his views, which so many people at the time declared would cost him the nomination.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

His brave words were these, "*If it is true*, as the Administration boldly proclaims, that our financial distress is occasioned by the Silver Purchase Law . . . *then why does not the Administration convene Congress and repeal that law?*" As to his own opinions he maintained a Stoic's silence. A few weeks later when a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress had acted upon his suggestion, he denounced them both for having "struck down the Sherman Law and given silver the severest blow it ever had."

In his first Report, July 1, 1893, Secretary Carlisle attempted no juggling with figures like his Republican predecessor. He made no secret of the situation, and emphasized by his clear statement of facts the sound and honorable lessons of economy which the President had preached in his inaugural address. The number of business failures for the first half year was without precedent. Equally unprecedented was the large proportion of assets to liabilities, which, as the "Nation" pointed out, showed that there was no general undue inflation of values but an accidental stringency caused by the money troubles. Senator Sherman, "whose name was unfortunately linked to the Act," stepped forward as a champion of its repeal, so soon as he saw the turn of the tide, and announced that the only reason for its original passage was the necessity of heading off by it a free-coinage bill. Meanwhile the silver Senators, emboldened by admissions of this sort, were full of fight and threatened "to tie up the Senate until the terms of some of its members expire," in order to get "free coinage or something akin to it." The debates in the Senate showed plainly enough that the silverites had been encouraged to assure their constituents that the attitude of the Republican party meant free coinage, just as they are to-day encouraged to construe, in accordance with their views and wishes, the ambiguous language of McKinley and the Ohio platforms of the last two years. It was quite clear that in 1888, as in 1896, they counted upon, and had been encouraged to count upon, the Republican candidate—no matter how the platform might be worded—not to veto a free-coinage act, should they succeed in forcing one through Congress. It was these disclosures, which the heat of discussion revealed, that gave point and meaning to Senator Sherman's admission that the party leaders "had no right to throw the responsibility of vetoing such a bill upon President Harrison" in 1890.

On June 30, Mr. Cleveland issued his call for an extra session and when Congress convened on August 7, he sent in his Message setting forth the plain facts and their logical deduction—the repeal of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

obnoxious law. Having pointed out to Senators and members of the House their duty, he quietly withdrew to Gray Gables and left them to do their work. The Repeal Bill passed the House promptly, but in the Senate it hung fire. Bland of Missouri met the Administration's challenge in the House by the offer of a substitute repealing the Silver Purchase clause and providing for free coinage out and out. Five amendments, all providing for free coinage and differing only as to the ratio, and a sixth, calling for a return to the conditions of the Bland Act of 1878, and the coinage of standard silver dollars "to wipe out the crime of 1873," were successively voted down, though on the last only a minority of his party sustained the President, and on Wilson's call for the previous question the bill was finally carried, 239 to 109.

On August 29, Senator Voorhees reported the measure from the Finance Committee with the famous amendment, tacked on to hold the waverers and conciliate such of the silver men as were willing, seeing that immediate free coinage was an impossibility, to accept a declaration of policy in line with their views, and which they could carry back to their constituents as a pledge for future enforcement. That amendment declared the policy of the United States to be the continued use of both gold and silver as standard money, and the coinage of both "into money of equal, intrinsic value, such equality to be secured through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as will ensure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals, and the paying power of every dollar at all times"; and pledged the efforts of the Government "to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetallism as will maintain, at all times, the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States in the markets in the payment of debts."

Over this compromise arose the great struggle. There was no way to cut off debate, for the Vice-President, when urged to do so, would not agree to refuse recognition to any Senator who might attempt to hold the floor in argument against the proposed change. The friends of repeal were discouraged. A compromise bill, making further concessions to the silver men, was prepared and a rumor set in circulation that it had the approval of Secretary Carlisle, and that enough Democratic Senators had been pledged to carry it through. But the President stood firm, and the Administration forces would not yield another inch beyond the Voorhees amendment.

Meanwhile, "out of doors," as the English politicians say, things had been moving apace. The currency famine of the summer of 1893

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brought into sharp relief the evils of the situation, and the stern logic of events began to tell. The firm attitude of the President had its effect on the waverers and the faint-hearted. People sickened of the dilatory tactics of the opposition and the weight of popular opinion upheld the Administration. On October 30, the Repeal Bill with the Voorhees amendment passed the Senate; on November 1, it was adopted by the House and immediately received the President's signature. It was as far in the direction of legislative relief for the financial situation as the Administration could persuade the Fifty-Third Congress to go. It would pass no measure for retiring the greenbacks, reforming the currency, or providing for an issue of bonds to replenish the gold reserve. Yet this one thing gave immense and speedy relief. It did not cure incurable evils nor carry with it all the beneficent results which were hopefully predicted. It did not justify, for instance, the rosy forecast of the "Nation" that "the relief to business interests would be so great that after six months there would be no silver party in the United States." But so soon as it became certain that the Government was to keep faith, continue to pay all its obligations in gold, and so maintain the gold standard, business began to pick up, credits were again extended, and by the middle of the following winter all the trade journals had begun to assume a more confident tone.

The issue of bonds to replenish the gold reserve, to which this Administration has four times been driven, had been accepted as a necessity and agreed to by the last Republican, as well as the present Democratic, Secretary of the Treasury. It was opposed by the silverites who denounced the sound-money policy and the sound-money men on both sides. Wolcott of Colorado called attention to—

> "the fact which has generally been understood through both Houses of Congress that both political parties, as represented by the present Secretary of the Treasury [Foster] and the Secretary of the Treasury to be [Carlisle], have coincided in the desire for the passage of the amendment which was to permit the Secretary of the Treasury to add to the public debt of the United States and to sell more bonds . . . the only effect of which was to make a gold scare in New York and depress the market for bonds and for securities."

The issues of $50,000,000 each in January and November, 1894, afforded only temporary relief, and the President in his Annual Message of that year renewed the attempt to secure the aid of Congress in his efforts to maintain the Government's credit. Again he strove to impress upon legislators the gravity of the situation, in the continued absence of statutory authority for cancelling, upon their payment in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gold, the obligations for whose redemption the gold reserve was held, and the continued existence of positive statutory orders for their immediate reissue, so soon as turned in. This, said he, in a figure which happily described the anomalous and ridiculous situation which still obtains, is but "an endless chain in operation constantly depleting the Treasury's gold and never near a final rest." He reminded Congress that the Government's pledge to maintain the parity between gold and silver required us, in order to keep national faith, to maintain the usual gold reserve, and warned them, if they did not see fit to provide for cancelling the greenbacks, that, so long as "the endless chain" remained unbroken, he would see to it that the country kept its word unbroken, and, failing their aid, he could again have recourse to his statutory authority, and purchase gold with bonds. "The real trouble which confronts us," said he when he renewed the attack in February, 1895, "is a lack of confidence, wide-spread and constantly increasing, in the continuing ability or disposition of the Government to pay its obligations in gold." The two issues of bonds already made had realized more than $58,000,000 in gold apiece. Since the second issue more than $69,000,000 had been withdrawn without cancelling a dollar of the obligations. The Republican pretence that an increase of revenue would cure existing evils of itself he easily disposed of by showing that we had a Treasury surplus of more than $63,000,000, but not in gold, and that the $500,000,000 of outstanding obligations, all calling for gold, could not be redeemed but had to be reissued, under the law, as soon as they reached the Treasury mill. Again he recommended an issue of bonds, bearing on their face the Government's pledge to continue its unbroken policy, *i. e.*, pay in gold. On the day the message was read Mr. Springer introduced a bill to carry out these recommendations. It was subsequently defeated by 135 to 162. The Republican vote was more than two to one against the bill; the Democrats were almost evenly divided, 89 supporting the Administration, and 93 opposing.

Two days later (February 17) Mr. Cleveland notified Congress of a third proposed sale of 4 per cent bonds to the amount of $62,400,000. The alternative contract with the Belmont-Morgan syndicate which he submitted was a shrewd object-lesson, bringing into clear relief the glaring absurdity of the situation. Mr. Horace White, in his recent admirable work, pithily describes the transaction and shows how the refusal of Congress to follow Mr. Cleveland's recommendation and change the ambiguous word "coin" to the word "gold," by which the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unvarying practice of a succession of Treasurers has always construed it, cost the Government more than $16,000,000 in interest, the contract providing that the syndicate should accept 3 per cent interest instead of 3¾ per cent, if Congress would make the bonds specifically payable in gold—in other words would only promise to keep on doing what it had always done.[1] But Congress refused to let the Government get the benefit of its credit, and by its refusal emphasized a doubt which has grown stronger every day since.

Of course after the danger had been met the Republican leaders carped at the way in which it had been averted. Senator Sherman, unmindful of his own operations as a Treasury official in the past and of his own recent recommendations, querulously criticized the President for taking the helm in his own hands and declared that the negotiation of loans was the exclusive function of the Secretary and should have been managed by him alone. Instead of honestly congratulating the Administration for demonstrating that the nation meant to keep its word, which gave the bonds their value so that their price rose in the hands of their holders, he snarled at the contract as "faulty and improvident," simply because the syndicate made money, as though that fact were not of itself highly creditable to the Administration. He seemed to forget the days when his own funding operations were denounced because of his course toward "favored" banks. An able and conscientious official himself when in office, he did not have the magnanimity in opposition to praise what he would probably have had the wisdom and courage, under similar circumstances, to do himself. Senator Lodge joined for the moment the chorus of silverites and populists and denounced the transaction as "the blackest public contract ever made by the Government of the United States." Having ascertained that it was a dangerous experiment to wait for aid from Congress, the next time the Treasury was in need of gold Mr. Cleveland acted promptly, and the bold and successful popular loan this year of $100,000,000 was negotiated without difficulty. When the bids were opened *bona fide* subscriptions for above five times the amount called for were in hand. It was plain that the people themselves were ready to back up the President in his determination to sustain the nation's credit.

[1] Mr. White calls this transaction "a financial achievement without a parallel in our history and equalled only by the quelling of the Baring panic in 1890 by the London syndicate, with the Bank of England at its head."—"Money and Banking," p. 211.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II.

In his first Annual Message the President called upon the Democratic majority in Senate and House to redeem the pledges which the party had given to the people in the victorious campaign of the preceding year. Conforming with his recommendations the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. Wilson, brought in his bill on December 19, 1893. It followed the Democratic principle of free raw materials, providing for free coal, wool, raw sugar, lumber, and iron; reduced the duties on many other articles, and made some additions to the internal-revenue taxes, so as to ensure a sufficiency of revenue pending the adjustment of business to new conditions. On January 24, against the President's judgment and advice, the Income Tax measure was introduced and subsequently incorporated with the Wilson Bill. On February 1 the bill with this clause passed the House and on March 20 was reported by Senator Voorhees from the Finance Committee with no less than 624 amendments, providing, for the most part, for additions to the schedules, and restoring sugar, coal, and iron from the free to the taxable list. The bill, with all the amendments proposed by the Committee, passed the Senate and on July 3 was reported to the House, with the declaration by Mr. Wilson, that "of all the chief free materials provided in the House bill only wool and lumber came back to us undisturbed by the Senate bill." The discussions of the Conference Committees showed that the chief points of difference related to sugar, iron ore and coal, silver-lead ores, the iron and steel schedules, especially pig-iron, steel rails, cutlery and structural iron. The widest divergence was on the sugar schedules.[1]

As the two Committees went into conference the President addressed an open letter to Mr. Wilson, urging him to insist upon the fulfilment of pledges the abandonment of which, he declared, "meant party perfidy and party dishonor." Once more he appealed to the Democratic majority to be faithful to their party policy, warning them "that no tariff measure can accord with Democratic principles or bear a genuine Democratic badge, that does not provide for free raw materials." For six weeks of a sweltering Washington summer the wrangle went on. The air was thick with charges of treachery and bad faith, the result of private "understandings" as to what the Democratic majority

[1] The House wanted all sugars free—raw and refined. The Senate proposed a 40 per cent duty on all sugar, a differential of $\frac{1}{8}$ cent on refined, in addition to $\frac{1}{10}$ cent on sugar from countries paying an export bounty.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the Senate would unite upon, and as to what the Administration would agree to. The Senate refused to yield their amendments; the House refused to concur. At last the House leaders held a caucus, voted to recede from their resolution of non-concurrence, and to pass the Senate bill. Wilson rose from his place on the floor to support the motion. Worn out with the long fight, weak in health and broken in spirit at the disappointment of his hopes, the sturdy supporter of the Administration and champion of Democracy strove to put on the best face possible and make the most of the situation. "This I do believe," he said, "that it is not so bad as the McKinley Bill," and with this faint and damning praise from the leader of the majority the bill passed the House—182 to 106. The President's disappointment was profound and he made no attempt to conceal the bitterness of his chagrin. He allowed the bill to become a law without his signature. In a letter to Mr. Catchings, explaining his attitude, he confessed "to a feeling of the utmost disappointment" at a result which, while "a vast improvement on existing conditions," presented such inconsistencies that he could not approve it. Of the recalcitrants within the party ranks he was outspoken in his scorn, declaring that "the livery of Democratic reform had been stolen and worn in the service of Republican protection," taking his stand with those "who have marked the places where the deadly blight of treason has blasted the councils of the brave in their hour of might." The metaphor was a little mixed, but the offenders knew who were meant and their ears tingled.

Congress adjourned with the Democratic majority broken and disorganized, the Republicans jubilant over the demoralization of their opponents and confident of success in the coming campaign. The election was only two months away. The popular verdict was prompt and decisive. The Republicans more than retrieved their overwhelming defeat of 1892, regained control of the House by more than a two to one majority, and changed the balance in the Senate once more in their favor, securing 43 seats to the Democrats' 39. The Administration had done its best for the party and the people; the people were defrauded of the fruits of a Democratic victory in the last national campaign, and the party as a whole paid the penalty for the default of a few.

III.

The question of the proposed annexation of Hawaii, which met the President at the very threshold of his Administration, was one of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most momentous issues which ever arose in our foreign relations, or indeed in our whole history. Without going into the details of that long controversy, the facts about which there is no dispute are that the Hawaiian revolution of January, 1893, the deposition of Liliuokalani, and her forced submission were encouraged and made possible by the conduct of the United States Minister Stevens.[1] Before a blow had been struck or a shot fired a company of marines was landed from the United States man-of-war "Boston," ostensibly for the purpose of protecting the persons and property of American citizens, though they were marched away from the resident and business quarter and stationed in a position to command the palace and the government buildings, nearly two miles from the persons and property which they were supposed to be guarding. Under protest, and declaring that she "yielded to the superior force of the United States Government," the queen resigned, and Mr. Stevens made a proclamation declaring the establishment of a "provisional government" pending negotiations with the United States, and immediately sent off a despatch with the triumphant announcement,—"The Hawaiian pear is now fully ripe, and this is the golden hour for the United States to pluck it." The whole thing was an affair of two or three days. The "Committee of Safety," as the revolutionists first called themselves, was organized on Saturday, January 14. On Monday, the 16th, the United States marines landed; on the 17th the provisional government was recognized by our minister; and on the 19th the commissioners sailed for this country to negotiate a treaty. They reached Washington on February 3, had an interview at the State Department on the following day; on the 14th the annexation scheme was agreed to and submitted to the Senate for ratification on the 15th! The matter was fortunately delayed over the 4th of March. On the 9th the new President promptly recalled the treaty, and soon after sent Mr. Blount, of Georgia, formerly head of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, as Special Commissioner to Hawaii to examine and report upon the facts. Armed with full authority, but cautioned against any interference with the right of the Hawaiians to settle their own affairs, Commissioner Blount reached the islands on March 29.

[1] Stevens was an appointee of Blaine, his former partner in the "Kennebec Journal." He seems to have imbibed, and attempted to carry out, the views of the late Republican Secretary of State. Blaine said in 1881, when a member of Garfield's Cabinet, that "Hawaii was part of the protective and commercial system of the United States," and in 1892 declared, "I consider the acquisition of these islands is of so great importance that I cannot conceive of such a proposition being refused."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Two days later he hauled down the United States flag, ended the "protectorate," and ordered the marines back to their ship.

On October 18, Secretary Gresham recommended that the treaty be not submitted, set forth the facts, and drew from them the unavoidable conclusion that the provisional government had been established by the act of the American minister and the uncalled-for intervention of our troops. Up to this point the reasoning and conduct of the Administration had been in the highest degree dignified, magnanimous, and strictly in accordance with the uniform policy of our Government and the most advanced principles of international law. But the next step was a blunder. Acting upon the assumption that the continued existence of the provisional government was due wholly to the belief that a loyalist uprising would be followed by a military demonstration on our part, the Secretary of State asked, "Should not the great wrong done to a feeble but independent state by the abuse of the authority of the United States be undone by restoring the legitimate government?" The answer to this question and the further duty of our Government were precisely opposite to what Mr. Gresham evidently assumed. His subsequent action upon this assumption—the only serious mistake during his whole administration, which he conducted in every other instance with a tact, wisdom, and dignity unsurpassed by any of his predecessors—placed the Government in a false and embarrassing position, from which only the stupid obstinacy of the queen and her advisers gave us the lucky chance to withdraw. Carried away by their sense of the gross injustice which had been done, both the President and Mr. Gresham failed to recognize the sad fact, as true in the intercourse of nations as in the relations of men, that there are wrongs which can never be wholly righted, a *status quo* which can never be wholly renewed, however magnanimous and anxious for restitution the offender may be. Because we had wrongly interfered to depose a queen did not justify us in a wrongful interference to reinstate her.

The plain implication to be drawn from the language which Mr. Willis, who in the meantime had succeeded Mr. Blount, was instructed to use, was that if the queen should "grant full amnesty to all who participated in the movement against her" the United States would lend its aid to put her back, even to the extent of using armed force. Fortunately for us the queen refused to give this pledge; the leaders of the provisional government declared that they would fight for their newly-acquired rights, and the Secretary of State was able to retrieve his mistake by telegraphing to the minister instructions to insist on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the promise of complete amnesty, adding the caution that "should she ask whether, if she agreed, active steps to reinstate her would be taken, then he was to answer that the President could not use force without the authority of Congress." In his Message reviewing the facts, in December, 1893, the President failed to distinguish between the right to compensation and the duty of reinstatement, and wrongly insisted upon the latter. But the queen's refusal to accept his conditions forced him to submit the whole matter to Congress, and both Houses, after passing sound resolutions approving the principle of non-intervention and pronouncing annexation or a protectorate inexpedient, let the matter drop. The blunder was as nothing weighed against the noble service which the Administration rendered by its prompt action in saving the country from the incalculable dangers and far-reaching consequences to which we were all but committed by the Republican President and Secretary of State. The future student of American history who reads of their extraordinary attempt to revolutionize our national policy by the incorporation, as part of our body politic, of the territory and inhabitants of a group of islands two thousand miles away from our extreme western coast, without warning, without an examination of the facts, and almost without debate, will lay little stress on the later error of the Democratic President who saved us from all this, and whose mistake was after all only a mistake of methods from the consequences of which we luckily escaped.

Secretary Gresham, after successfully concluding the treaty with Japan, negotiating and completing a treaty with China and coming to an agreement with Great Britain by which the protectorate on the Mosquito coast was given up, died on May 28, 1895. His death was a heavy loss to the Administration and the country; and the changes in the Cabinet which followed were not changes for the better. They took from the head of the law department, to make of him Secretary of State, a conscientious, hard-headed, able lawyer, a man seemingly inclined to treat with bull-dog contempt the ordinary amenities of diplomatic intercourse and to carry on the business of his office with the tone of an aggressive lawyer "claiming everything in sight." Lord Palmerston used to say that there were few matters of state which could not be arranged better by a friendly note than by a formal despatch. Mr. Olney seems to think that due personal and national self-respect requires that he should on all occasions set his foot down hard, with a sturdy indifference to other people's feet and their tender spots—a good old Puritan trait for which some of the historic characters of the most

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

famous city in New England are not wholly undistinguished. There is such a thing, especially in negotiation, as doing the right thing in the wrong way. To "protest against the enlargement of the area of British Guiana in derogation of the rights and against the will of Venezuela," to reassert in firm and dignified language the time-honored doctrine "consecrated by well-nigh a century of observance," and finally to propose a submission to arbitration of the whole controversy,—were surely right and proper things to do. They asserted no claim to which we had no title, gave a plain but not unfriendly warning, and above all not only left open but suggested a method of settlement honorable to all parties and in accordance with what people in the highest rank of civilization are coming more and more every year to regard as consistent with "the true grandeur of nations." But to boastfully declare that "to-day the United States is practically sovereign on this continent and its fiat law . . . because its infinite resources, combined with its isolated position, render it master of the situation and practically invulnerable as against any or all other powers" was surely a way of expressing one of the tenets of our policy which had not been called in question, to whose form at least exception might be taken, not only because of its vulgar braggadocio, but possibly on the ground of actual fact. And to demand in peremptory language "a definite answer" was to commit on a much larger scale and in a far more ticklish matter the same error into which we stumbled at a certain stage of the Hawaiian business, when our representative was instructed to declare in sharp and positive terms what the President "expected" the provisional government to do. It implied a threat. Gentlemen in their intercourse with other gentlemen, and first-class powers in their relations with each other, do not use threats, except in the last resort and when a peaceful settlement is out of the question. Even then it is better to strike without threatening.

Once more, however, the *deus ex machina* who seems ever hovering over the stage of American diplomacy descended from the flies. By the purest chance, far less offensive language used by the head of another nation in an entirely different matter, caused England to flame with wrath from shore to shore at the very moment when her unresentful treatment of our overbearing tone was causing some short-sighted folk to say that the old English spirit was cowed. When at the mere hint of German interference all England flared up, people on this side of the water began to realize that while Great Britain might put up with a good deal of "bounce" and swagger from us, she would resent with all the old-time spirit aggressions from any other quarter; and we

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

began to admit that ties of kinship counted, and that to have kindred institutions, a common history, to be "brothers speaking the same dear mother tongue," meant something, after all.

The sober second thought of the nation has worked its beneficent results. Out of all the loose and foolish talk of war the Plan of Peace has come—a peace to be guaranteed and made permanent by the labors of those whose activities have been stirred to renewed efforts by the very events of which we have been speaking, and who would give their labors, and their lives if need be, to see their nations join hands and take the first step in the next great advance along the long road from barbarism to the highest civilization of which the human race is capable.

IV.

In spite of Mr. Cleveland's record as a civil service reformer both as Governor and President, and in the teeth of the Democratic platform and his letter of acceptance, the votes of 1892 had hardly been counted before the office-seekers began to swarm. So severe became the pressure, so incessant the demands upon his time at a period when questions relating to his future policy, the composition of his Cabinet, and the settlement of his private affairs required every moment he could give to them, that he was forced to issue an address demanding to be let alone, and warning those who persisted that their encroachments on his privacy would defeat their own ends; for he declared that not only would he pay no attention to their appeals, but the fact that they made them at this time and in this way would be taken as a presumption against them. This sharp admonition had a wholesome effect and the President-elect, instead of spending his days in discussing the merits of this man for postmaster at Podunk and of that one for consul at Kotung, was permitted to devote his time to the consideration of such minor matters as the currency, the tariff, and foreign affairs. Upon taking office he renewed his pledges of fealty to the merit system by the best earnest he could give,—in urging Theodore Roosevelt to remain upon the Civil Service Commission, and in the publication of what was appropriately called "The Second Emancipation Proclamation," in which he besought Senators and Representatives not to introduce constituents during the hours set apart for talking with him on public business. In the matter of civil service reform Congress gave to the President but a half-hearted support. It was one thing to adopt resolutions denouncing the other party for their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"scandalous prostitution of public office to partisan ends," and pledging their own to the maintenance and extension of the reform system, but quite another thing for individual members of Congress to refrain from nagging the President and the heads of departments for places. It was true, as the President said, that "the law embodying this reform found its way to our statute book more from fear of popular sentiment in its favor than from any love of reform itself on the part of legislators"; and the words of his Message were emphasized by the captious spirit with which Congress refused to grant sufficient funds for the support of the Commission, and once even struck off the appropriation altogether, though it repented of its petty spite next day and restored the item.

The President was hampered, too, by what he once impatiently called "the querulous impracticability of many self-constituted guardians" of the reform, whose "vagaries and sublimated theories" tried his temper pretty severely. There were times, too, when Mr. Cleveland's own appointees seemed likeliest of all to discredit the system. Mr. Quincy, the Boston civil service reformer, found the minor consulships so clogged with Republican driftwood, and started in so vigorously to get things clear, that the inevitable result followed. Starting in with the undoubted intention of replacing incompetent Republicans by competent Democrats, he was soon carried off his feet and ended by finding himself driven to the wall and unable to make any defence to the charge of "looting the consular service," other than the plea that any other course would have disrupted the party and prevented other and greater reforms to which the Administration was pledged.

When Mr. Whitney succeeded in persuading Mr. Cleveland to appoint as minister to Italy a gentleman who, though of ample means and leisure, had never been connected with public life or concerned in politics except to the extent of a generous campaign subscription, and was absolutely unknown to the country at large, both "Harper's Weekly" and the "Evening Post" dropped their arms in despair and the latter declared that the President "had given his own reputation a blow from which it could never recover."

While Mr. Cleveland did not hesitate to express openly his disapprobation of the choice, by the party leaders in his own State, of Mr. Murphy for United States Senator, he took no steps to defeat their action, or to aid those who were supposed to be his particular friends in their continuance of the fight against the State machine. In this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

way both sides were angered. But when he recognized the "regular" Democratic organization in the city of New York by the appointment of some Tammany men to office, there were loud and bitter complaints from some of the President's staunchest supporters that he had deserted his friends and gone over to the enemy. The New York "Nation" said:—

"The President has done little or nothing to disarm hostility or to increase the number of his friends. He is not 'magnetic,' and if we said he had winning manners we should depart widely from the truth. Ever since he came into office he has almost studiously ignored his chief supporters of 1884, 1888, and 1892. He has not sought their counsel, and he has apparently tried to forget that they ever served him."

Spretæ injuria formæ? It may be true that a positive and decided stand by the Administration in 1893 might have saved the party in his own State from the awful follies that have dragged it from a position of complete supremacy to the overwhelming defeats from which recovery seems still so far away. Yet those who blamed the President for failing to act at that time forgot that to justify Presidential interference in State politics, no matter how laudable the purpose, is a dangerous precedent, opposed to Democratic principles, and invariably disastrous in the long run.

In his annual address before the Civil Service Reform Association in December, 1894, Mr. Schurz declared that the hopes that Cleveland "would abstain from changes in the service not required by the public interests had not been fulfilled," although admitting that "excepting the headlong overturning of the consular service, the changes have, on the whole, been less rapid than under the preceding Administration." Meanwhile, Mr. Cleveland, in spite of lukewarm Congresses, hostile spoilsmen, and disappointed friends, went steadily ahead. He revolutionized a whole department in the interests of the reform system by instructing Postmaster-General Bissell to consolidate the smaller offices with the principal ones adjoining, so as to make them branches and bring them under civil service rules. The Postmaster-General himself urged taking the whole department out of politics and recommended the passage of a law withdrawing the fourth-class postmasters (about 66,000 in number) from the list of Presidential appointments, and placing them on the competitive list. Congress, it is needless to say, has not acted upon the suggestion.

Before 1894 was ended the President brought within the operation of the reform more than 5,000 places in the Treasury, Post Office, In-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

terior and Agricultural Departments; by the end of 1895 he had added about 4,000 more, and in those two years had transferred to the competitive list 3,048 offices besides. By December, 1895, he had added to the competitive list 12,646 places—9,598 by original classification and 3,048 by transfer from the exempted list. In the consular bureau the President and Mr. Olney have effected a radical and splendid change, bringing within the civil service rules all the consulships under $2,500 a year—196 out of 320; and the selection by the Secretary of State of a Commission in sympathy with the reform was a pledge for the success of the scheme.

When Mr. Schurz delivered his next annual address in December, 1895, he was able to assure his gratified audience, amidst the applause of reformers from all over the United States, that "he believed President Cleveland to be determined, as to the extent of classification, to leave to his successor little or nothing to do that can be done by Executive action alone." Finally, it will be seen how well this hope has been justified by a reference to the President's order of May, 1896, which rounds and completes the work of his Administration in building up and extending this reform. More than 30,000 offices are by this order brought within the rules—practically every office. "The entire list of positions at Washington, not filled through the merit system, is reduced to approximately 100," said "Good Government," the organ of the Civil Service Reform Associations, in its issue of May 15, 1896.

Mr. Cleveland has thus nobly redeemed the pledges which he gave, and which his party ratified, to strengthen and extend this great reform. He put the axe at the root of the spoils system, and so far as lay with him to make it so Presidential patronage is a thing of the past. Legislation alone—legislation such as he urged Congress to enact—can complete the work, and that, since the people plainly wish it, they are bound to get.

V.

Mr. Cleveland is nearing the end of his second term. Congress, the control of which has passed to his opponents, pays little heed either to his appeals for necessary legislation or to his warnings against wasteful expenditures. He has given over expecting or asking for laws to cure existing evils in our financial system, and contents himself with checking extravagance, and blocking crude and hasty legislation by the interposition of a timely veto. Every now and then a gust of reckless-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ness sweeps over Congress and the rank and file on both sides break from their leaders, join hands in a log-rolling raid, and "jam" through enormous appropriations of public money to be spent on ships and fortifications, pensions, rivers and harbors, in ways the Treasury cannot stand and the people do not call for. Meanwhile, in spite of the most careful and painstaking economy in the administration of the finances, cutting down expenses here and adding to the net receipts there, the deficit is slowly creeping up, while the drain upon the gold reserve goes steadily on. The day of reckoning will surely come; a day when there will be an appeal from Congress drunk to the people sober. And the men on both sides, whatever their nominal party names may be, who have refused the Administration aid, flouted the President's warnings, and in times like these, with a wasted surplus and a falling gold reserve, have voted away millions in extravagant expenditures, will be called to account.

Posterity will not rank Mr. Cleveland as a brilliant statesman. The pages of the historian will not glow with stories of his winning personality, his attractive magnetism, his delicate tact. But when the roll of American Presidents is scanned and their careers are searched through for examples of diligence in business, steadfast upholding of party principle, sturdy fidelity to party pledges, rigid economy of the public moneys, and a dogged insistence on national good faith in the face of furious hostility and faint-hearted support,—a candid and grateful posterity will rank among the very highest on the list the second Administration of Grover Cleveland.

GEORGE WALTON GREEN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STUDIES OF NOTABLE MEN: BARON DE HIRSCH.

WHEN the news was flashed across the wires that Baron de Hirsch was dead it caused a pang of sorrow over the four quarters of the earth—men stopped with hushed breath and heavy hearts, and silently paid homage to him whose benefactions circled the globe from the pyramids to the Golden Gate. Baron de Hirsch cannot be measured by ordinary standards—his activity was both varied and colossal, whether as financier, organizer, railroad constructor, diplomat, statesman, man of the world, or philanthropist. But as the rivulets run into rivers, and the rivers empty into the ocean, so did all these qualities culminate in equipping him with the resources, power, and capacity of becoming the leader of a gigantic exodus of his fellow religionists. No man, perhaps, in our day has by his own efforts amassed so large a fortune as he, and surely no man in his lifetime ever distributed so large a one for the welfare of others. He had a wonderful capacity for making money, but more wonderful still was his heaven-given impulse to do the most good with it. His gigantic enterprises in constructing those arteries of civilization, the railroads, through benighted lands, through Russia, Roumania, and Turkey, brought him into close relations not only with the Czar and the Sultan, with ministers and diplomats, but also with the humblest hewers-of-wood and drawers-of-water, the men who plied the shovel and wielded the pickaxe in digging the road-bed for his iron horses.

A few details of family history, and a brief reference to his numerous benefactions, may precede a fuller consideration of Baron de Hirsch's philanthropic aims and methods. He was born on December 9, 1831. The Baron's grandfather, Jacob Hirsch, who was born in Bavaria in 1764, founded the financial eminence of the family, was appointed royal Bavarian court banker, and raised to the rank of the nobility. He was a man of generous nature and great public spirit, and in him the noble bias for philanthropy, which distinguished his son and grandson, was notably shown in many charitable works. His second son, Joseph, succeeded his father as court banker, and by his ability and enterprise greatly increased the financial and commercial importance of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

family. King Louis II. raised him to the hereditary baronage in recognition of "his fidelity to the throne and in acknowledgment of his many useful works." His eldest son, Baron Maurice de Hirsch, the subject of this article, after a plain but sound education and some time spent in his father's counting house, engaged in business on his own account. In 1855, having previously married a daughter of Senator Bischoffsheim, he became a member of the banking house of Bischoffsheim and Goldschmidt. He soon became the master mind of the bank, and from this time onward his financial, commercial, and railroad enterprises were a record of unbroken successes scarcely paralleled. But in the midst of these successes his generous heart and alert mind kept in close touch with plans, broadly conceived and skilfully realized, for the uplifting of his fellow men.

He was probably most generally known and esteemed in England, although he prized his connection with Austria-Hungary, of which he was a domiciled subject and where he had his chief place of residence. His benefactions in England were for the general good, including splendid gifts to hospitals and other charitable institutions. Vienna, Buda-Pesth, Cracow, Lemberg, and other cities also benefited by the Baron's generosity. The Alliance Israélite Universelle, an association founded for the education of Jews in the East, has also derived practical support from the Baron's munificence. On learning that the funds of the Alliance had proved insufficient for the maintenance of its schools, he presented a large sum to supply deficits, continued his aid for several years and in 1889 consolidated his donations and replaced them by a fund whose annual income of $80,000 is used in the maintenance of elementary and apprenticing schools.

It was in behalf of plans for Jewish emigration and colonization, however, that his most earnest efforts were enlisted. He endowed a trust fund for the benefit of Russian Jews who had settled in the United States, and also established a colony of Russian Jews in the Canadian Northwest. His chief concern, as is well-known, was for the betterment of his oppressed coreligionists in Russia.

With the accession of the late Czar there came a policy of reaction, devised with the finesse of the nineteenth century, but outstripping in its diabolical purposes the barbarity of the Middle Ages. The inspirer of this ungodly crusade against five millions of peaceful, unoffending, and loyal subjects, is the Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church. When asked how those infamous "May laws," that embody his policy, would rid Russia of five million Jews,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he is reputed to have answered, "One third will be driven into exile, one third will be forced to conversion, and one third will die of hunger." This was in 1881 and 1882, and the enforcement of these laws has been accompanied by pillage, burning, and death. Baron de Hirsch was then fifty years of age, engrossed in his many affairs. He stopped, to the surprise of every one, in his mid-career, he marshalled his resources, and turned his active brain and tireless energy to the problem of reclaiming his suffering coreligionists from humiliation worse than slavery, from starvation and destruction. His first move was to offer to the Czar, through this same Chief of the Holy Synod, fifty million francs for education in Russia, to be applied without distinction of creed or race, hoping that the dissemination of education, mechanical and mental, would in the end induce a better condition, from the lowest to the highest of the Czar's subjects. But Russian autocracy was framing laws to limit, not to extend, the advantages of education, and rejected the munificent offer unless Baron de Hirsch would remove his conditions and permit the expenditure to be made as the Czar and his minister saw fit. But Baron de Hirsch was too well-acquainted with Russian officials to part with his money in order to line the pockets and adorn the palaces of the persecuting Russian ministers of state.

The great philanthropist in his affinities, friendships, and associations was neither Christian nor Jew—but cosmopolitan. Creed lines had no significance for him. He was already well-known for his generous contributions in many directions and for many causes. The misery, and not the race nor the religion of the Russian Jews, attached Baron de Hirsch to their cause and summoned him, as by a voice from God, to assume the colossal task of devising plans and pouring out his treasures with endless munificence in colonizing them in other lands. In a magazine article published five years ago he said :—

"In relieving human suffering I never ask whether the cry of necessity comes from a being who belongs to my own faith or not; but what is more natural than that I should find my highest purpose in bringing to the followers of Judaism, who have been oppressed for a thousand years, who are starving in misery, the possibility of a physical and moral regeneration?—than that I should try to free them, to build them up into capable citizens, and thus furnish humanity with much new and valuable material? Every page in the history of the Jews teaches us that in thinking this I am following no Utopian theory, and I am confident that such a result can be attained."

Here let me say in answer to some evil-disposed critics who, incapable of adequately appreciating the magnificent unselfishness of the man and the boundless scope of his philanthropy, have attributed his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enormous benefactions to the bereavement he had suffered in the death of his only son—a handsome young man of brilliant promise,—that he had begun to devote his energies to the self-imposed task of his life before this calamity had befallen him. He had for years given annually very large sums to maintain ordinary and trade schools, hospitals, and asylums throughout Oriental countries. He had maintained hospitals and had given large sums of money for relief during the Russo-Turkish war, and had sent one million francs to the Empress of Russia for charitable purposes. He had begun negotiations for a foundation, which was enlarged to some twenty-five million francs, for educational institutions in Galicia consisting of forty institutions, wherein five thousand pupils, without distinction of creed, are being instructed. He had hoped that his son, who doubtless would have realized the hope had he been spared, would make it the aim of his life to carry forward and perfect his projected works of benevolence and philanthropy. The loss of this promising son was a severe blow to him, and doubtless had the effect of enlarging and extending his benefactions. On one occasion when it was stated that Baron de Hirsch had lost his son and heir, he replied: "My son I have lost, but not my heir: humanity is my heir."

Following an interview, partly true and partly not, a rumor was circulated that he advocated that the Jews of Russia should abandon their faith and become Christians. To correct this he sent a reply to some gentlemen in England, therein stating he had hoped that he had given too many proofs of his devotion to Judaism and to the Jews to be suspected of hostility to a people he had defended with so much spirit and supported with his resources. Profoundly afflicted at seeing so many of his coreligionists reduced to misery by reason of religious or racial hatred, he desired simply and plainly to tell the anti-Semites that persecution intensified religious sentiments and defeated the very objects they sought to attain. He added, "Remove every barrier, admit your Jewish compatriots to every right and the advantages of social life, and there will be more chances for effecting the fusion which they appear desirous of bringing about."

In perfecting and carrying forward his plan of relief, Baron de Hirsch, cosmopolitan as he was, speaking half a dozen languages with readiness, and on terms of intimacy with many of the leading rulers and statesmen of Europe, applied all his vast powers and opportunities. There is little doubt that his social relations with princes and statesmen, philosophers and literary men were, in many instances, cultivated

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as influential channels to further his philanthropic plans, just as an ambassador, singly devoted to his country's welfare, utilizes social life to advance interests committed to his charge. That such was his purpose, and not to gratify any personal ambition, is shown by the absence of vanity in his nature. No appeals made to him to set aside funds, or to make public donations, for the erection of buildings and monuments to perpetuate his name, ever enticed him to divert his money from his plans of philanthropy. He was not an ascetic, but rather a Sybarite. He loved fine horses, equipages, and the luxuries of life. Whatever he undertook he did on a large scale, whether as financier, philanthropist, or as an owner of racers. Even his pleasures contributed to charitable enterprises. His winnings on the turf and the proceeds from the sale of his horses, aggregating half a million dollars, he distributed among the London hospitals.

It is, of course, impossible to give a complete list of Baron de Hirsch's benefactions, but the following are probably the best known: Jewish Colonization Association, $10,000,000; De Hirsch Trust for the United States, $2,500,000; Trust Fund for education in Galicia, $5,000,000; Fund for assistance of tradesmen in Vienna and Buda-Pesth, $1,455,000; Fund for the Hungarian poor, $1,455,000; Turf winnings during 1891–4, distributed for charitable purposes, $500,000; Gift to the Empress of Russia for charitable purposes during Russo-Turkish war, $200,000; Gifts in 1893 to London hospitals and other charities, $200,000; Gifts to Alliance Israélite Universelle, $400,000; Proceeds of the sale of his son's racing stud, distributed among charities, $60,000. These alone amount to the enormous sum of nearly $22,000,000.

His constant care was not to overcrowd the lands to which his army emigrated—he did more than all restrictive laws have done to regulate the exodus and the immigration, to select men who would apply themselves to handicrafts and principally to agriculture. He had an abiding faith that the Jews of Russia, if properly directed, would again become tillers of the earth as their forefathers had been in Babylon and Judea. He never tired of dwelling upon the importance of directing the immigrants in these channels exclusively, so that they would become a part of the sturdy yeomanry of the countries wherein they settled, and would realize the promise of peace and security contained in the prophet Micah: "But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid." These views were clearly and forcibly expressed by Baron de Hirsch in THE FORUM for August, 1891. He wrote:—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"In the lands where Jews have been permitted to acquire landed property, where they have found opportunity to devote themselves to agriculture, they have proved themselves excellent farmers. For example, in Hungary they form a very large part of the tillers of the soil, and this fact is acknowledged to such an extent that the high Catholic clergy in Hungary almost exclusively have Jews as tenants on mortmain properties, and almost all large landholders give preference to the Jews on account of their industry, their rectitude, and their dexterity. These are facts that cannot be hid, and that have force, so that the anti-Semitic movement, which for a long time flourished in Hungary, must expire. It will expire because every one sees that so important a factor in the productive activity of the country—especially in agriculture—cannot be spared. My own personal experience, too, has led me to recognise that the Jews have very good ability in agriculture. I have seen this personally in the Jewish agricultural colonies of Turkey, and the reports from the expedition that I have sent to the Argentine Republic plainly show the same fact. These convictions led me to my activity to better the unhappy lot of the poor down-trodden Jews, and my efforts shall show that the Jews have not lost the agricultural qualities that their forefathers possessed. I shall try to make for them a new home in different lands, where as free farmers, on their own soil, they can make themselves useful to the country."

In the prosecution of his plans he searched in every direction for reliable and responsible agents, men who combined brain with heart for the work, especially avoiding those who clamored for lucrative employment, who stormed his door and filled his mails with applications. He cared not to what religious sect such agents belonged; he wanted men, true men of capacity, whose hearts throbbed with philanthropic impulses. His most valued helpmate in all his work was his wife, with whom he took counsel and to whom he imparted every detail, who read his letters and assisted in his correspondence, who accompanied him in his travels and shared his every hope and encouragement —for discouragement he never entertained. Baroness de Hirsch is a remarkable woman, kind, gentle, accomplished, and most simple in her tastes. She is a lady bountiful wherever she goes and spends a large part of her separate fortune in maintaining schools, asylums, and hospitals, which she visits personally and directs with discrimination and judgment. At Constantinople, I have known her day after day to visit the poorer quarters of the city—and they are very poor—and relieve with her own hands the misery and poverty among Mohammedans, Christians, and Jews.

Until his death some ten years ago one of the most efficient of Baron de Hirsch's agents was the Chevalier Veneziani, who installed a number of Masonic lodges in the Orient and expended large sums of money for the Baron in establishing hospitals, homes, and schools. The Baron was instrumental in inducing Hall Caine, the author of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The Manxman," to visit Russia some few years ago for the purpose of studying the condition of the peasants and lower classes. Mr. Caine, it is believed, made a report to the Baron, but he was so impressed, or depressed, with the sadness of the conditions he there found, that he has not as yet been able to write out and publish the result of his observations. Mr. Arnold White, an authority on sociological questions who has had much experience among the lower classes in London and on the Continent, was sent by Baron de Hirsch on a mission to Russia. He selected Mr. White because of that experience and in spite of the fact that the latter in his writings had shown himself rather prejudiced against his cause. The Baron wanted light, not sentiment, to guide him in his vast plans, believing as he did that permanent good is only defeated by the temporary expedients which sentiment interposes. He realized that colonizing was like planting trees—it required time to bear fruit; his hopes rested upon the children of the emigrants and upon the succeeding generation. The forty years in the wilderness might be shortened, but not escaped, until the Promised Land should give its blessings.

Baron de Hirsch's noble work does not cease with his death, but rests on carefully planned foundations, administered by agents he chose in the several countries. His idea was that in time the work would be self-acting and that the first comers, after they were settled and had reached a certain degree of independence, would attract others to themselves and lead out more and more of their brethren, so that in another generation Russia, freed in part from the activity and energy of the Jews, would learn to appreciate their economic value, or, like another Spain, meet her deserved fate and become a helpless victim of her own intolerance.

The Baron never took part in politics in any form. They were not to his taste; he doubtless recognized that favoring one side would array the other side against his project for the relief of the Russian Jews. He admired men with courage and firmness for the right, and when he learned of Mr. Cleveland's election to the Presidency in 1892 he wrote me a letter expressing his congratulations to the country in selecting as its Chief Executive a man of liberal views and large heart, who stood firmly upon his convictions as against expediency or policy.

Baron de Hirsch is the Napoleon of this great exodus, and for every life that great Liberator of the Jews of France lost in his Russian campaign, Baron de Hirsch has led out two lives, whose children's children will not forget Russia, but will swell the ranks of the sons of liberty,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and in the end will triumph where Napoleon failed. There is something greater than autocratic power or the power of armies or of navies —and that is the aroused indignation of the civilized world. Before the altar of eternal right and justice kings must bend the knee and dynasties moulder into dust:—

> "For freedom's battle, once begun,
> Bequeathed by bleeding sire to son,
> Though baffled oft, is ever won."

OSCAR S. STRAUS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THEODORE ROOSEVELT AS A HISTORIAN.

It may seem to be carrying coals to Newcastle for any writer to endeavor to make Mr. Theodore Roosevelt a more marked man than he is already. As I am sure, however, that no success I may have in this endeavor will cause an additional number of suspicious-looking packages to be sent him through the mails, I shall frankly avow my intention of trying to show that Mr. Roosevelt should be a more marked figure among our leading historians than I fancy he is at present. His successes as a hunter and explorer of indomitable energy, as a fluent and interesting writer upon these and kindred topics, and as a politician more anxious to secure pure politics than party supremacy,—have, it seems to me, somewhat militated against his obtaining proper recognition as one of the most thoughtful, conscientious, and illuminating historians of our national career that we have yet produced. And it is the irony of fate that those qualities of the man that militate against his present reputation as a historian are precisely the qualities that give his historical work such unique and, as I believe, lasting value. No one without Mr. Roosevelt's experience of pioneer life as a hunter, and his ability to judge the characters of men and movements as a politician, could possibly have given us his masterly work on "The Winning of the West," the fourth volume of which has just come from the press.[1] I might go farther and say that no one without Mr. Roosevelt's buoyant patriotism, his uncompromising, if not aggressive, Americanism, for which he is sometimes unduly censured, could have written the eight volumes of history and historical biography that I now propose to examine.

Mr. Roosevelt's first venture as a historian was made in 1882, just two years after his graduation from Harvard, but not before he had begun to distinguish himself by his efforts to purify New York politics. He chose a theme eminently congenial to his early developed patriotism, but somewhat foreign, it would seem, to the tastes that were already winning him reputation as a hunter—a landsman *par excellence*,

[1] "The Winning of the West," Vol. IV.—The Northwest and Louisiana, 1791–1807. By Theodore Roosevelt. N. Y.: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he undertook to write a history of "The Naval War of 1812." I do not know whether his technical knowledge of nautical matters was derived from personal experience or not, but it was plainly sufficient to make his book take high rank at once among the treatises of its kind, and his general ability as a writer, here first displayed on a considerable scale, created sufficient demand for the volume to warrant the appearance within a twelvemonth of a third edition enlarged by a chapter describing Jackson's victory at New Orleans. This added chapter and certain remarks in the new preface are more important to a critic of Mr. Roosevelt's historical work than all the rest of his interesting book, for they show that thus early the theme of his greatest work—the career and prowess of the western frontiersman—had laid fast hold upon his imagination.

The chapters dealing with the naval war proper seem, as has been said, to be technically satisfactory, while the patriotic enthusiasm of the author, whose love of adventure would naturally make the theme congenial to him, and his direct vigorous style carry the general reader along through what is certainly a very glorious portion of our national history. On land, except at New Orleans, Mr. Roosevelt's buoyancy might well have flagged; even Mr. Henry Adams's more equable genius has hard work to keep its wings extended wide over what is certainly the most disgraceful period of our national history. But in dealing with the great victory of Jackson and his Tennesseeans at New Orleans our author was in his element, as much so as when in the body of his book he took delight in exposing the mendacity of the British naval historian, James; and so he has given us a chapter that must be consulted by every student of our history who wishes to understand what is still the most brilliant feat of arms of the nation whose self-respect it did so much to restore. It is perfectly idle, as Mr. Roosevelt shows, to attempt to underrate the military genius displayed by Jackson or the matchless coolness and bravery of his troops; and the fact that the battle was won after peace had been determined upon does not affect in the slightest degree its real importance to the people of the United States. It was a great and brilliant battle whose story is in itself so stimulating and enthralling that we naturally forgive its historian his slight turgidity of style, especially as there is scarcely a trace of this to be found in any of his subsequent work.

Mr. Roosevelt's next book described his western experiences, and so stood him in some stead when he undertook to write the life of the West's most typical ante-bellum statesman—Thomas Hart Benton.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Benton's career needed just such elucidation as Mr. Roosevelt's acquaintance with frontier conditions could give it. To the ordinary historian, hampered by eastern traditions, the character of the Boanergean Senator from Missouri would have been little short of inexplicable. His ponderous erudition, placed at the service of an Administration which of all others has the reputation of having had the least use for learning of any sort save that relating to the doctrine of passive obedience, his remarkable capacity to be fatuously wrong and splendidly right within the limits of a single speech, his ability to remain for a score of years uncrushed between the millstones of North and South, his singular lack of humor and tact, combined with utter unselfishness and bravery whenever the Union was in danger,—make him a figure thoroughly puzzling to any one who does not understand the West and the kind of men it produces. Mr. Roosevelt does understand the West and so he did justice to Benton. He had little opportunity, however, to show his skill as a biographer, for his book was necessarily rather a study in political history with the career of Benton as a guiding thread. But as Benton's career practically covered the momentous period between the Missouri Compromise and the civil war, Mr. Roosevelt had an admirable opportunity to show what might be expected of him should he ever undertake to write political history upon a larger scale. The reader of 1887 would, I think, have had a right to conclude that such an undertaking would meet with considerable but still only partial success. He would have concluded that Mr. Roosevelt would be masterly in his power to grasp and present salient points, but would at the same time be liable to fail to bring out many of those minor points that serve to clarify and make firm and consistent our knowledge of a historical epoch; that the very vigor and straightforwardness of his mind would cast a flashlight wherever directed but intensify the darkness elsewhere. In other words, the impartial reader would have perceived from this biography of Benton that its author might easily in his zeal for his own heroes and causes do injustice to other men's heroes and causes; that, to speak concretely and from example, Mr. Roosevelt could understand Benton's course with regard to the fight against the Bank, while quite failing to catch the real explanation of Calhoun's course with regard to Nullification.

This conclusion would not have been disturbed by a perusal of Mr. Roosevelt's biography of Gouverneur Morris which in 1888 followed the Life of Benton. By writing most acceptably the life of this secondary but still real statesman of the Revolution our author

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

practically completed his survey of the nation's history prior to the civil war, and his powers and limitations as a political historian were quite fully displayed. He showed himself to be thoroughly capable of grasping the true significance of every great movement in our history and of doing justice to our typical men of positive opinion and aggressive action. He failed chiefly when he had to deal with men of more or less negative or critical opinion and of indirect action. He could do ample justice to Washington, less than justice to Jefferson, and positive injustice to Jefferson Davis, whom, by the way, he accuses without foundation (in his Life of Morris) of having been implicated in Mississippi's repudiation of her debt. But these defects must have counted for little with any reader capable of appreciating Mr. Roosevelt's patriotism, his thorough sympathy with the people and comprehension of the part they have played in shaping the destiny of the nation, his utter lack of sentimentality, and finally his fearless denunciation of all that has been wrong or low or weak in our relations with foreign powers and in our management of ourselves. The author of the Lives of Benton and Gouverneur Morris might in 1888 have essayed such tasks as Mr. Schouler, Prof. McMaster, Mr. Henry Adams, and Mr. Rhodes have set themselves, and he would have won laurels in the competition; but he had already essayed a task more congenial to his powers. He had left the devious paths of the politicians for the trails of the pioneer and the Indian through the western wilderness; instead of becoming one of a number of methodical students of our political and social evolution in the settled East, he was to become practically the sole historian of the mighty *Völkerwanderung* that passed the Alleghanies and peopled the mid-continent.

The first two volumes of "The Winning of the West" appeared in 1889; they covered the period from 1769 to 1783. The third volume appeared in 1894 and brought the narrative down to 1790. The fourth volume, which has just been issued, ends with the expedition of Pike in 1807. Roughly speaking, then, the work, so far as it has been completed, begins with the first organized movements of population beyond the Alleghanies and ends with the discovery of the Rockies, thus including the foundation of the Watauga and Cumberland Settlements, of Kentucky, and of the abortive State of Franklin; the winning of the Northwest Territory and its subsequent division into the State of Ohio and the Territory of Indiana; the establishment of the Mississippi Territory; and finally the purchase and exploration of the immense domain acquired from Napoleon under the name of Louisiana. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

four volumes therefore constitute a connected history of the mid-continent during its formative period. They have been based upon special research of the most thorough and far-reaching character and are the history at once of a region and of the separate States composing it. From this point of view they need fear no comparison with other works devoted to the Northwest, the Southwest, and the various component States. They are full, accurate, and admirably written, and have the additional advantage of possessing unity and comprehensive sweep. They would have a unique and lasting value were this all that could be said in their favor.

But this is by no means all; it is indeed the least part of what one can and ought to say about this great work. Merely to have written in a pleasing and accurate manner the annals of the States and Territories enumerated above would have entitled Mr. Roosevelt to gratitude, but hardly to admiration. Critical admiration is not due to the annalist but only to the historian who has shown in his work the broad grasp of the philosopher and the keen intuition of the poet. And this I claim Mr. Roosevelt has done to a remarkable degree in his "Winning of the West"; and therefore while I thank him as a citizen of Tennessee for having given me by far the best history of my adopted State and region, I thank him still more as a man and a student for having given me a history that enlarges my comprehension of the character of the nation and people to whom I belong, and fills me with emotions of pride and pleasure by unfolding to me the heroic and noble deeds of the generations that have preceded me.

Now what is this but to say that Mr. Roosevelt possesses a philosophic judgment and an epical imagination? He has seen that the history of the West is something more than a mere account of the adventures of hunters like Boone and Mansker, or a narrative of the guerrilla-fighting and State-building of a man like Sevier, or the annals of a people of small frontier farmers. He has seen that the history of the West is the history of the movement of a people which cannot be understood except in connection with the similar movements that have characterized the Aryan race, and especially the English portion of it, for centuries upon centuries. Thus as a philosopher he brings the history of the mid-continent into its proper relations with European, or rather with universal, history, linking the deeds of the Scotch-Irish of Tennessee with those of their forefathers across the ocean and with those of all peoples who have waged the war of civilization against barbarism and savagery. Nor is this all, for the true philosopher is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not satisfied with reading the past; he must interpret the present and try to fathom the future. So Mr. Roosevelt is never weary of pointing out to us the part the West has played in making the American nation what it is—how the axe and rifle of the frontiersman kept the newly freed States from being pent up along the Atlantic seaboard through the jealousy of European powers, and how in the fulness of time the region settled under the control and auspices of the General Government stood by that Government in its hour of peril and saved the Union. The winning of the West is thus the winning of the fairest portions of a continent and of the hegemony of a hemisphere, and the historian who has most fully grasped and presented this idea is surely one that deserves our admiration.

But Mr. Roosevelt has done more. He has not merely estimated like a philosopher the value of the western people's services to the nation and to humanity; he has like a poet loved and comprehended and sympathized with the western people themselves. He has not fallen into—indeed he protests times without number against—the foolish error the East has committed of underrating and sneering at the West ever since there was a West to sneer at. Such fatuity and banality are far from Mr. Roosevelt. He is a man and an American, and nothing that is human and American is alien to him. Himself a citizen of New York, he is thoroughly at home in Tennessee and in Montana; himself a Northerner with intense Union sympathies, he is never lacking in courtesy and friendly feeling toward Southerners of a different way of thinking. He grows eloquent over Andrew Jackson, and has the courage to maintain that Lee is the greatest military genius this country has produced; thus showing his freedom from bias though doing, perhaps, an injustice to Washington. His patriotism and Americanism are, however, not at all of the flamboyant style. He sees that with all their virtues the western people have had many faults and some vices and he does not seek to disguise the fact. At the same time he will not imitate those historians who keep a sharp eye open for the failings of all sections save their own. He denounces justly the early separatist movements in Tennessee, but he is equally emphatic in his denunciation of the Hartford Conventioners and the "league with hell" Abolitionists. Yet fairness and intelligent comprehension are not so potent as enthusiasm and love in enabling a historian to do justice to a people. It is because Mr. Roosevelt has a large and manly heart that his imagination takes a poetic form and enables him to live with and be one with his characters. Daniel Boone

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is no mere lay figure to him, but a real man whose quaint clothes and queer orthography warrant no patronizing; George Rogers Clark is to him neither a Hannibal nor a besotted Catiline, but a strong man who in his prime did a great deed that helped to build up a great nation. Mr. Roosevelt is able, then, to treat the positive and direct characters of the frontier people with the sympathy and intelligence of a dramatic poet, and he tells the story of their western migration with a verve and sweep that are truly epical. He has but one rival in this respect—Cooper. The "Leather-Stocking Tales" and "The Winning of the West" ought to save us from the yearly infliction of an attempted national epic; but they probably will not.

A minute examination of the four volumes that constitute Mr. Roosevelt's chief title to fame will not be expected in an appreciation such as this paper is intended to give, but it may be well to pass their main features rapidly in review. The first two volumes are perhaps the most interesting, but the last is nearly if not quite up to their level. The third, which followed after a long interval during which its author was wrestling with the problem of the civil service, dealt with the least picturesque features of the general subject and needed condensation. The process of excision might also have helped a few chapters of the earlier volumes, but on the whole the latter contained little that the special student or even the general reader would part with. The descriptions of the spread of the English-speaking peoples, of the French settlements in the Ohio valley, of the Northwestern and Southwestern Indians, of the primitive life led by the borderers amid the Alleghany ranges, of the exploits of Boone and the "Long Hunters" and of Sevier and Robertson, of the settlement of the Watauga country and Kentucky, and of the various contests with the Indians just before and during the Revolution, leave nothing to be desired in point of interest and little in point of execution.

The opening of the second volume is still more interesting and dramatic, for the exploits of George Rogers Clark[1] would enliven the pages

[1] Clark's conquest of the Illinois region, by the way, is dismissed with a line and a half in an otherwise excellent school manual of our history which shall be nameless here. This is a fair sample of the methods of the average eastern historian, but it is paralleled by a southern historian's equally scanty mention of the services of Chief Justice Marshall in interpreting the Constitution. If Clark had thrashed a hundred Indians on the sacred soil of Massachusetts, or if Marshall had devoted his energies to showing how the Constitution might be weakened and evaded, both would doubtless have fared better at the hands of the writers to whom I allude.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

even of a historian of far less narrative power than Mr. Roosevelt possesses. It is needless to say that Mr. Roosevelt puts a proper estimate upon Clark's great services to Virginia and, as it fortunately turned out, to the nation at large. He gives a whole chapter to the dauntless captain's campaign against Vincennes—to that inclement march across the overflowed plains which ought never to be forgotten by any man who admires pluck and endurance and the determination to conquer or die. Compared with this chapter the accounts given of the gradual peopling of Kentucky and the Holston Settlements, and of the foundation of the Cumberland Settlement by Robertson (himself a pioneer hero of fine character and ability) naturally show a slight decline in intrinsic interest, but the balance is made even again by the fine chapter on the battle of King's Mountain. I am not sure that Mr. Roosevelt has ever done a better piece of work than this, and I think that few historians have surpassed the power of picturesque and vivid narration that he here displays. As I read it I can see the sombre frontiersmen riding through the mountain gorges and I can hear the sharp cracks of their rifles as they surround the gallant Ferguson and his ill-fated veterans.

As I have already stated, it seems to me that the third volume needs condensation. There is a little too much repetition of border warfare and life—a criticism which I think applies as well to certain chapters of the prior volumes. Condensation, too, might have helped the description of the political events in the West between 1784 and 1790, which, however, gave the volume its chief and very real value. For this was the period when the separatist movements for the control of the Mississippi began, and when men like Clark, Wilkinson, and Sevier intrigued with the jealous but decrepit power of Spain. It was also the period of the brief existence of that curious little commonwealth of Frankland, or Franklin, which has attracted an interest far out of proportion to its intrinsic historical importance. It is needless to say that Mr. Roosevelt treats these movements from the point of view of a strong nationalist, but that sympathy with the often sorely tried backwoodsmen never fails him. The reader's sympathy sometimes fails for the dim-eyed eastern statesmen who were utterly oblivious of the great interests of their western empire.

The fourth volume sets us once more in the midst of dramatic scenes. We are present at St. Clair's defeat and at Mad Anthony Wayne's victory at the Fallen Timbers. Then the scene changes to Tennessee and we assist at the birth of the first State formed from a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Territory, an event which the people of that commonwealth have just celebrated in their centennial exercises. Next we are brought in contact with renewed Spanish intrigues and filibustering movements on the part of the backwoodsmen, and with the operations of the numerous swindling companies formed to speculate in the newly acquired and ample territory. Then after a glance at the state of affairs in Kentucky and Ohio, both being fast settled up, we come to the purchase of Louisiana and Burr's conspiracy. Here Mr. Roosevelt has the disadvantage of being obliged to follow Mr. Henry Adams, but he performs his task well in spite of the limited space at his command. The volume concludes with a brief but graphic account of the exploring expeditions led respectively by Lewis and Clark and by Lieutenant Pike. The mid-continent has now been practically won and has been settled, though as yet sparsely, as far as the Mississippi; but there is still much for Mr. Roosevelt to tell. The exploits of Jackson against the Southwestern Indians, which opened up Mississippi and Alabama; the repulse of the British from New Orleans, the gradual settlement of Missouri and of the Northwest, the brave deeds of Houston and his comrades in Texas, the Mexican war and the acquisition of the Pacific coast, the rush to California, the partition of Oregon, the settling of the Great Plains, the migrations of the Mormons, the attitude of the West toward slavery and the Union, and finally the linking together of the uttermost edges of the Continent by railroads and continuous settlements—are topics that may be expected to enliven the four future volumes of his noble and sustained work.

But while we are looking to the future it may be as well to call the author's attention to a few points with regard to the style and general arrangement of his work that can hardly fail to impress themselves upon a careful reader who goes straight through the volumes. In the first place it is obvious that, although this is the day of long histories, the mass of readers will be deterred from undertaking the perusal of "The Winning of the West" on account of its length. It is equally obvious that there is a great deal in the volumes that every American who makes any pretension to being a reading man ought to know. The conclusion is plain that Mr. Roosevelt ought sooner or later to give us a one-volume history of the great movement he is describing. He is the only man thoroughly competent to abridge his own work, or rather he is the only man competent to give us a new but briefer work covering the same field; for an abridgment is generally a poor affair. This new work need not interfere at all with the usefulness of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more monumental history, for the latter will always be needed by the student and by the man of letters. But when new plates are required for the larger work a slight amount of recension and condensation will prove advantageous as regards both matter and style. Mr. Roosevelt, as I have said, writes with a force and a fluency that carry even the critical reader away, but his style not infrequently shows traces of hurry. Too great use of the split infinitive and an occasional ambiguity resulting from carelessness in the use of pronouns are faults that may be corrected easily without the loss of a particle of the sincerity and force that give his style its marked and attractive individuality.

I make these criticisms the more willingly because I think that when he is at his best Mr. Roosevelt writes as well as any man need desire to write, who is not aiming at that elusive glory of being considered a master of style. The truth of this statement will be plain to any one who will take the trouble to analyze the impression made by a rapid reading of the chapter describing the fight at King's Mountain. The effect can be summed up in a brief sentence—You are at the battle. Surely this is a better test of the quality of a man's style, than can ever be furnished by minute rhetorical analysis, which would I suspect convict Mr. Roosevelt of offences at which a pedant would shake his head. But, as every reader of this article may not be able to turn at once to the chapter referred to, I shall allow myself the pleasure of making a quotation which will serve not only as a sample of Mr. Roosevelt's style at its best but also as an illustration of his habit of linking the history of the West with that of the world. He is describing in the second chapter of his third volume the life of the British officers at the frontier posts, and he continues:—

"But the important people were the army officers. These were imperious, able, resolute men, well-drilled, and with a high military standard of honor. They upheld with jealous pride the reputation of an army which in that century proved again and again that on stricken fields no soldiery of continental Europe could stand against it. They wore a uniform which for the last two hundred years has been better known than any other wherever the pioneers of civilization tread the world's waste spaces or fight their way to the overlordship of barbarous empires; a uniform known to the southern and the northern hemispheres, the eastern and the western continents, and all the islands of the sea. Subalterns wearing this uniform have fronted dangers and responsibilities such as in most other services only gray-headed generals are called upon to face; and, at the head of handfuls of troops, have won for the British crown realms as large, and often as populous, as European kingdoms. The scarlet-clad officers who serve the monarchy of Great Britain have conquered many a barbarous people in all the ends of the earth, and hold for their sovereign the lands of Moslem and Hindoo, of Tartar and Arab and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pathan, of Malay, Negro, and Polynesian. In many a war they have overcome every European rival against whom they have been pitted. Again and again they have marched to victory against Frenchman and Spaniard through the sweltering heat of the tropics; and now, from the stupendous mountain-masses of mid-Asia, they look northward through the wintry air, ready to bar the advance of the legions of the Czar. Hitherto they have never gone back save once; they have failed only when they have sought to stop the westward march of a mighty nation, a nation kin to theirs, a nation of their own tongue and law, and mainly of their own blood."

Now there is but one epithet that will suit this passage and that is "fine." And I use it with all the more pleasure because there seems to be quite a school of historians in this country who have a holy horror of anything like style. They appear to think that a good style is incompatible with thoroughness of research—and it certainly is if we judge exclusively from the works they favor us with. But mere thoroughness of research never yet made a man a great historian. To be that he must possess imagination, and if he has imagination he is sure to have style. I need not therefore apologize for making this long quotation which illustrates both Mr. Roosevelt's poetic imagination and his powers of style, even though its insertion compels me to dismiss without criticism the excellent volume on the city of New York which the versatile author published [1] in 1890.

I have little to say in conclusion save to emphasize the opinion that we have had few abler or more conscientious historians than Mr. Roosevelt. I know of none who has had a broader or firmer grasp upon the main threads of our history, of none who has more thoroughly linked the present of the nation with its past, of none who has judged men and events, take them all in all, with more candor and sympathy and insight. He has the defects of his qualities, but who has not? He does not always understand the drift of minor currents, he does not always do justice to men of negative or critical ways of thinking, he does not always keep on the high table-land of impartial history and refrain from descending into the plains of present and party politics. But this is only to say that Mr. Roosevelt is impetuous and human. His friends would not have him otherwise, and I feel sure that all unbiassed readers of his books are his friends. For behind the true historian always stands the true man, and the reason that "The Winning of the West" is a noble and patriotic book is that its every page is stamped with the personality of its author.

W. P. TRENT.

[1] "New York." Historic Towns' Series. N. Y.: Longmans, Green & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CARDINAL MANNING, ANGLICAN AND ROMAN.

THE "Life of Cardinal Manning," [1] by Edmund Sheridan Purcell, Member of the Roman Academy of Letters, is one of the most extraordinary biographies ever published. It quite rivals Mr. Froude's treatment of Thomas Carlyle in what one might style its brutal frankness. Like Mr. Froude, Mr. Purcell was selected as biographer by the subject of his biography, and his letters and diaries after personal revision and excision were placed by Manning in Purcell's hands. The author has therefore taken no undue advantage of the confidence placed in him, by using material unapproved by the Archbishop of Westminster. Canon Morris, another convert, in high favor with both Cardinal Wiseman and Cardinal Manning, and who was to have written the life of Wiseman, had he not died prematurely, asked Mr. Purcell: "On what principle is the Life of Cardinal Manning based? Do you relate the simple facts without omissions and embellishments; or do you by what is called 'judicious suppressions' produce an idealized picture instead of the man as he was in truth and reality?" On hearing the answer Canon Morris added: "In so complicated a life as Manning's you have pursued the safest, wisest, and indeed the only honest course." Cardinal Manning himself told Dr. Purcell that he might write, from the material given him, what sort of a life he chose, only asking to see the passages relating to his married life, every record of which he had cut out of his diaries, and which he indeed left in shadow,—not because that life was not happy, but because its happiness was out of tune with the life of a great ascetic ecclesiastic, as whom the Cardinal wished to be known and remembered.

In his use of the material, already expurgated by the Cardinal, Mr. Purcell displays both the lights and shadows of his character, giving a by no means flattering but yet a very complete view of his extraordinarily imperfect nature. The result is that we see a strong, but by no means a lovely, image. As in life the meagre figure of the man seemed to reveal the frame rather than the form, so in this biography

[1] 2 vols. New York: Macmillan & Co. 1896.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is the skeleton rather than the clothing of flesh and blood which is impressed upon the reader. The book in its effect corresponds to a photograph taken by the X rays of Röntgen, a cathodograph rather than a photograph, displaying the articulation of the anatomy usually hidden in mercy from the eye, meant to be inferred rather than depicted, but here emphasized so as to produce the image of a man full of defects but of unflinching purpose, whose only variableness was that of the methods taken to accomplish an invariable end.

One cannot but think that this "Life" has been written to conciliate the present Pope and the English Catholics. The time of Manning's supreme influence was during the pontificate of Pius IX. The trend of that time we know. It was the establishment of ultramontanism which reached its climax in the promulgation of the dogma of Papal Infallibility. The tone of English Catholicism was far more moderate, and Manning's whole course after he joined the Church of Rome was a protest against what he termed the lax and disloyal attitude of English Catholicism, of which he regarded Newman as the exponent. When Leo XIII was elected Pope, the atmosphere at the Vatican changed. It assumed much more the tone of English Catholicism, and Newman, hitherto neglected, was promptly made a cardinal. Now while Mr. Purcell does not wish to conceal Manning's great services to the Roman Church, he yet does not wish to express approval of that strain in him which set him in a direction contrary to the present trend of ecclesiastical affairs at Rome. He seeks to present him to his countrymen and to the Vatican as one who had conferred distinguished service, but as one who failed to recognize the value of what was in any measure opposed to his own school. The "Life" is an effort to exhibit him as a great ecclesiastical force, and yet to recognize and extol the other forces now in the ascendant. In fine, he seeks to conciliate the Pope and the English Roman Catholic laymen, while depicting and honoring the achievements of one whose whole course was a protest against their cherished traditions and sympathies. He does this without any display of literary skill. His style is repetitious and cumbersome. The arrangement of the material is awkward; the construction of the narrative is clumsy; the grammar of the sentences is often slipshod and at fault. The "Life" gains no interest from the way in which it is told; its course seems rather to be obscured by the infelicity of the narration. But the man and the scenes in which he lived, the vicissitudes of his career, and the critical periods of history through which he passed and in fashioning which he proved a potent factor,—all these

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

elements are of so stirring a nature that there is no lack of interest in the book. It was well said of Maurice that he wrote clear sentences and produced a muddy page. This book illustrates the opposite quality. We have muddy sentences and a clear page. One reads the clumsy clauses under protest and with a weariness prophetic of total discontinuance; but one does not discontinue. The subject lures the reader on; although there is bewilderment there is also fascination, and as a final result there emerges a very vivid likeness of the man. It is like an impressionist picture, whose material seems crude and irrational, but which a proper point of view reveals gleaming with vitality and force.

So much for the volume; now for the man. Manning was not a religious youth like Newman or Pusey. He was always correct, but not until after he left the University did he become devout. He records that in his boyhood's days it was the fear of hell that kept him steady, but this fear failed to lead him to devout courses of thought or conduct. Nevertheless, it always remained through life a strong element in his religious character. The impulse seemed to be far less the satisfaction of his spiritual nature than the dread of what might occur if he should miss the truth or be unfaithful to it. He was not an earnest student either before or after entering the University. He took things so easily while a schoolboy at Harrow, that there was a thought of putting him in his father's banking house; and, when it was decided to send him to Oxford, he had to be coached for nine months by a private tutor (after leaving Harrow) to avoid being plucked at the entrance examination. While at the University his distinction came from his ability as a debater at the Union, of which he was a brilliant member, and not from any proficiency in his studies. Indeed it was a surprise to every one when he took his degree of B. A., in 1830, together with a first-class in classics. But under his tutor he had learned to concentrate his mind, and this, with a natural quickness in acquiring knowledge, enabled him, while taking part in all the sports of the University, to cram in a short time and stand well in examination. Here, as elsewhere afterward, his nature is shown to be not that of a student but that of one bent on acquiring position and distinction by use of study. His eye was on the prize, not on the goal. And even in the University, with all his mingling with the debaters in the Union and the athletes in sports, he did not form intimate friendships with his fellows. As in after life, he lived very much apart—self-centred, more alive to ambition than to sentiment. He was at Oxford with Gladstone, and Henry and Robert Wilberforce, and during Newman's residence (as fellow of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Oriel); but it was later family relationships which brought him into closer fellowship with them.

On leaving Oxford Manning's religious opinions were quite unformed. The questions which were stirring the hearts and minds of Newman, Hurrell Froude, and other future leaders in the Tractarian movement had no interest for him. He was bent on politics and a seat in the House of Commons. During his university life, however, his father lost his fortune, and this gave a death-blow to the son's hope of political preferment. It was when in a despondent frame of mind on account of this financial misfortune that Manning spent a long vacation with his friend Robert Bevan, who with his sister and family were strong Evangelicals. What the preaching of Newman at St. Mary's failed to do the counsels and influence of Miss Bevan accomplished, and he calls the effect of his intercourse with her and her family his "conversion." He thus began his religious life as an Evangelical. In referring to these friends many years after he said:—

> **"They showed me a side of religion which the Anglican writers, except J. Taylor and Bishop Hall, seem unconscious of. I have always believed that Anglicanism and Puritanism are the ruins of the outer and the inner life of the Catholic Church from which they separated at the Reformation and then split asunder. This accounts for the dryness of Anglicanism and the disembodied vagueness of Evangelical pietism."**

He records, however, that,

> **"None of this drew me from the desire of public life. I had a drawing to Christian piety; but a revulsion from the Anglican Church. I thought it secular, pedantic, and unspiritual. I remember the disgust with which I saw a dignitary in Cockspur Street in his shovel and gaiters."**

With his awakened religious interest Manning did not at once purpose going into the Church. After leaving Oxford he obtained a place in the Colonial Office. It was a subordinate position which promised little advancement and that slow; and he soon discovered that his father's bankruptcy had given a fatal blow to his entrance into Parliament. This collapse of worldly expectation and an unfortunate love affair induced a despondency which inclined him to listen and yield to the pressure of his family and the solicitation of his friends to take orders. There was in this step a mixture of motives; but distinctly the most prominent motive at the time was the prospect of a more congenial position and an opportunity for a more influential career. The presence of a more spiritual aspiration, which he affirms in a retrospect fifty years after, does not appear in his letters and diary of the time.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

His biographer affirms: "It is clear Manning was driven against his will to take up the Church as a profession." He himself in a letter to his brother-in-law, John Anderdon,—a warm Evangelical,—wrote at the time:—

"I think the whole step has been too precipitate. I have rather allowed the insistence of my friends, and the allurements of an agreeable curacy in many respects to get the better of my sober judgment."

The fact was that a curacy at Lavington was offered him through his friend Henry Wilberforce, and a fellowship at Merton College was now open to him as a clergyman, which he had sought and which had been refused him as a layman. Fifty years later he writes:—

"I resolved to give myself to the service of God, and of souls. It was as purely a call from God as all that He has given me since. It was a call *ad veritatem et ad seipsum*. As such I tested it, and followed it."

In the light of what followed years after, in regard to his appointment as Archbishop of Westminster, it is evident that Manning referred directly to God what was the outcome of much skilful management on the part of his friends.

His biographer, with the utter frankness which marks his comments throughout, explains the discrepancy of Manning's earlier and later statements by saying (p. 94):—

"Undoubtedly it was a wrench to his heart to give up his political aspirations. But there was no help for it, for he knew now that they had no material bottom. To become a clergyman was a sacrifice,—a sacrifice, however, not of his own choice, but imposed upon him by the necessity of things."

Yet Manning writes in 1883:—

"If I ever made a choice in my life in which my superior will controlled my inferior will, it was when I gave up all the desires, hopes, aspirations after public life at the dictate of my reason and my conscience."

The biographer comments as follows:—

"If the broad outlines of his life in youth were impressed on the mind of Cardinal Manning, in his old age the details had long since faded from his memory. . . . What more natural than to attribute the self-sacrifice made in youth to the spiritual motives and ideas with which his mind had since become so deeply imbued? He was conscious of the potentiality in himself of such sacrifice. It was only a lapse of memory to convert the potential into the actual."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thus in the beginning of his career the struggle between the *Dr. Jekyll* of his spiritual nature controlled and impelled by religious fear, and the *Mr. Hyde* of his worldly nature stirred by ambition for prominence and predominance, was clearly manifest. It characterized his whole after-life both as an Anglican and a Roman Catholic. That life was so varied that we can only glance at certain salient points in it; but there was the same conflict and commingling of forces in all its crises.

He married in the very beginning of his life at Lavington a lovely woman, the daughter of the rector (the Rev. John Sargent), who took him as curate, and a sister of the wife of Samuel Wilberforce, afterward Bishop successively of Oxford and Winchester. He speaks in 1880 of this marriage (a very happy one whose speedy termination four years later by the death of his wife was a great blow to which he never could refer) as follows: "Knowing nothing of the Catholic life or instincts or perfections, in November, 1833, I married." He himself destroyed all diaries of that time, but as his biographer points out in a note: "In Manning's diary, dated 1844–47, among 'God's ten special mercies' is to be found the date '1837,' the year of his wife's death." This could only have been in reference to his ecclesiastical life, as it cleared away every obstacle to his entering the priesthood on his conversion to Rome. Possibly he recognized that the influences of so noble a wife might have kept him contented with the Evangelical pietism which characterized the years of his married life and which later he regarded as so unsatisfactory. In after years the Ward and Manning faction of the perverts used to say that the greatest blow to Catholicism in England was Newman's conversion (he being a tower of strength to the Moderate party). The English Catholic laity were said to respond, No, it was the death of a woman—referring to Manning's wife—that left him free to run his ecclesiastical course.

Manning was from the start a devout believer in God and the Bible and an earnest preacher among the poor of his secluded flock. He had succeeded to the rectorship of Lavington on the death of his father-in-law the year after his marriage. "As a Catholic," he said of himself, "I was a Pietist until I accepted the Tridentine decrees." He was a strict disciplinarian and, according to his biographer, somewhat of a martinet in regard to his church and its services. He was, however, the pride and hope of the Evangelical party as represented by the "Record" newspaper, though in 1835, when he preached his first sermon in Chichester Cathedral, he spoke in defence of Apostolical

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Succession. It was for the authority and regular commission of those who, like himself, preached Evangelical doctrines, that he contended. His theme was "Our Commission to Witness for Christ." But from the time of his wife's death in 1837 a change was impending. In 1838 he was quick in discerning that the Tractarian movement was becoming a power in the land; the fact of popularity appealed to him then as always; and he preached at the Cathedral in the June of that year a sermon on "The Rule of Faith" which thereafter associated him in men's minds with the Tractarians, though it did not identify him with them. He stood in this sermon (which was published with voluminous notes) for the Anglican position of the Scriptures interpreted by the Primitive Church—in opposition to the Roman position of their interpretation by a living and organized authority, as well as to the Evangelical interpretation by individual illumination by the Holy Spirit. Newman and Keble approved the sermon, with reservations, but the Evangelicals were disheartened and dismayed. The "Record" roared its displeasure. This was Manning's first controversial treatise.

It is impossible in so brief a paper to follow his course onward to his conversion to Rome. It was all characterized by advocacy of church rule and authority: first, as against the royal commission on ecclesiastical property; second, in its right to define and enforce dogma by purely spiritual courts—*i. e.*, courts not only composed of bishops, but of bishops not appointed thereto by the Crown.

The marked distinction between him and the Oxford leaders was that, while going in the same direction, his principal interest was in church government, theirs in its dogmatic and doctrinal system. He was an ecclesiastical politician, they were ecclesiastical doctors and teachers. He was still Manning the statesman in the Church, instead of in Parliament, as had been his first ambition—*Cœlum non animam mutavit*—when he entered the priesthood. While Pusey and Newman were busy with the restoration of Catholic faith and practice or discipline, so-called, the soul and mind of the body, Manning was occupied and interested in the ecclesiastical prerogatives and status of the Church, their form and attitude. He speedily inclined more and more to the views of the Oxford leaders. In 1838 he began to hear confessions and receive penitents. He had cut loose from the Evangelicals, but yet did not identify himself with the Tractarians. He tried to keep in touch with both. Circumstances favored this. He was far from the scene of the fray. As rector of a quiet parish

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

near Chichester and afterward as archdeacon of the diocese, he determined to rule efficiently and with popularity. So he endeavored to maintain a position of compromise, which really compromised himself.

Both sides finally repudiated him, so far as the leaders went. The "Record" threw him off with violence, Newman quietly withdrew all confidence. For, while he privately set up his confessional, he publicly acquiesced in the condemnation of Tract Ninety. As his biographer points out, he stood quite aloof from the Tractarians when once they became the losing party. He preached a strong no-popery sermon in St. Mary's, Oxford, after Tract Ninety had come into disfavor, and when he went out to Littlemore after its delivery to see Newman, the recluse firmly declined to see him. There were, however, many and influential persons with whom he continued on terms of intimacy, and Mr. Gladstone was one of them. The powers in Church and state he was bent on placating, and Manning was everywhere recognized as a man of power. He was an effective preacher, his sermons were eagerly read, and his fame became widely diffused. It was said by some in high quarters that it was impossible to prevent him from being made bishop. His own mind was evidently set on that goal, and he was too sagacious to injure his prospects by a too close affiliation with suspected and distrusted men. It is not just to say that he was merely ambitious or unscrupulously so. He confesses to much worldly ambition in his diary and deplores it; but he never seems to have got rid of it. His idea of his own usefulness was that he should be in a prominent position of leadership for which he felt fully competent and for which the general judgment affirmed him fully competent. Ambition spake with the voice of conscience and he meant to accomplish his end if a skilful diplomacy could secure it. Thus though he had a spiritual nature which was not slumbrous, and mental difficulties and distractions which were genuine, the prominence and permanence of his ambition for place and distinction disturb our sympathy and alienate our respect. His difficulties were chiefly those of a perplexed ecclesiastical politician, and he could not come into accord with such earnest though mistaken seekers after truth as Newman and his closest friends.

Through all this time Manning held the admiration and confidence of Gladstone. Yet it afterward transpired that he had not given his own confidence. Until the time of the Gorham Judgment Mr. Gladstone, who shared his intimacy, or thought he did, and who saw him often and corresponded frequently with him, had no notion whatever

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that Manning's confidence in the claims of the Church of England were shaken. Not a word had been uttered or written to him indicating doubt on the subject. And when, after Manning's death, his letters to Robert Wilberforce during this period were shown to Gladstone, containing as they did open confession of very serious and ever increasing doubts, and at last of distinct convictions that the English Church was in heresy and delusion and therefore devoid of authority, Mr. Gladstone could hardly believe his eyes. He said that he would not charge Manning with insincerity, but he certainly had not been straightforward. It is significant of the man that his doubts, culminating in his distinct rejection of the claims of the Church of England, were expressed in confidence to a fellow clergyman who could not affect his fortunes and were withheld from the statesman who could advance them. Manning had some years before his death requested from Mr. Gladstone the return of all the letters which he had written him during this period. He received and *destroyed* them all. On learning this Mr. Gladstone expressed his indignation by saying, "Had I dreamt that he would destroy those letters I would not have returned them to him." This act of Manning's indicates that he recognized that silence concerning his real thoughts to so intimate a friend as Mr. Gladstone, who supposed he had received his complete confidence, might indicate a duplicity whose charge he would gladly escape.

The same double course was pursued by Manning in regard to his parishioners. He gave them the strongest reasons for trusting the Church of England even after his own confidence in her had become shaken. There is, of course, this explanation at hand,—that he must show confidence in the Church he was serving, until he left her, and that he could not impart the doubts, which were consuming his own loyalty, to others until prepared for the final step. But it is evident that no man with a truly honest mind could have continued ministrations which contradicted his own convictions. He could at least have remained silent and refused to give counsel, when that counsel did not represent his own mind. This is what Newman did on his retirement to Littlemore. This is what Manning would have done had his interest been more in the substance than in the framework of the Church.

Yet amid all his doubts and adverse conclusions, he seemed to be hoping that something would turn up to place him in power, where he might rule the Church in the interests of those who distrusted and would transform her. At this time a bishopric might have re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tained him an Anglican, while he was at heart a Romanist. He later expressed thankfulness that he had escaped this snare. It was when he saw that he was not to be made bishop that his repudiation of the English Church grew apace. The defection of Newman and Ward and Oakeley and other distinguished Tractarians did not move him. But, though technically not one of them, he was popularly and rightly regarded as essentially one with them, and the distrust and distress were too deep and widespread to permit the elevation of such as he. This conviction became clear to him. When, then, the Gorham case came up there was a clear opportunity to act. He himself said, it was not so much the (to him) heretical decision concerning baptism as the claim of the right of the court to decide it, which convinced him that the Church of England had abdicated her spiritual authority. That court was indeed composed of bishops among others and wholly of English Churchmen; but it was appointed by the Crown, therefore it was not in his eyes truly ecclesiastical or authoritative. Yet its authority was acquiesced in practically by the ecclesiastical powers, though there was violent protest on the part of some against it.

Manning now withdrew from his archdeaconship and after some months was received into the Roman Church. The dogmatic temper of himself and of his sympathizers could not tolerate any divergence of view concerning the same doctrine in the same communion. They were ecclesiastical exclusives. Canon Mozley, a very great thinker and a very high Churchman, conceded that the views of Gorham were allowable under the formularies, but Manning called the decision "abolishing an article of the creed." He shared the intolerance of absolute determination, and the whole question in his conversion was as to where authority inhered. Once that was decided, whatever it decreed must be taken without question.

Thus after he had conformed to Rome, in his letters to his friend Robert Wilberforce who was still hesitating over what seemed to him doubtful decisions of Rome, Manning urged steadily the one point of her authority to decide as she had done, and that any criticism of her decision was simply the assertion of private judgment against the judgment of the Church, and therefore heretical, in its method as well as in its substance. To the objection of Wilberforce that he could not identify the modern Roman with the Primitive Church, he replied that the Roman Church, notwithstanding her developments, decided that she was the same, and should not her judgment of her own position be paramount? There was nothing but private judgment to oppose to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it. The quality of the Church's acts could not have any weight when once the acts were hers. The appeal to history was heresy because she had infallibly interpreted history.

The life of Manning after his conversion was guided by the same principles as those which had ruled in him as an Anglican: only the predominant worldly traits now became more apparent and intense. For now there was no balancing between ecclesiastical principles and popular prejudice, and, advanced to the priesthood ten weeks after his submission, he at once took an aggressive mien and policy which might bring him into prominence. He was in dead earnest to vindicate his new position and he stirred up opposition and dislike in the minds of the more moderate English Catholics, both clerical and lay. "I cannot bear that forward and intolerant priest" was the expression of more than one of his new associates. But he saw the drift of the Roman Church at the time and it was as consonant to his nature as to his interests to push to the extreme the views which had decided his own conversion.

The Church was possessed not only of absolute truth but of absolute illumination in regard to its meaning and development. An infallible revelation demanded an infallible interpreter. The illumination of the Holy Ghost is as perpetual as His presence. Does His presence sustain the stream of grace and not sustain the stream of truth? It must do both, and the Church must not only have an infallible interpreter, but a perpetual one. If the body possess the function, how much more the head. Moreover, the body cannot always be assembled in council, but the Pope always abides. He must be then the infallible interpreter, and he with the consenting council must define his office and make it clear. So he went on and became the most aggressive priest and bishop, as Ward was the most aggressive layman, for the ultramontane doctrine of the Church of Rome. It may be said with soberness that, but for these two converts, the dogma of Infallibility would not in all probability have been promulgated by the Vatican Council. They urged and argued it, they worked unceasingly for it. Manning came thus into high favor with Pope Pius IX, and was made Archbishop of Westminster when Cardinal Wiseman died. The intrigues concerning this appointment instigated by Manning, the enforced relinquishment of his claims to the succession by Bishop Errington (of the Moderate party), which was compassed by Manning, the command of the Pope to Errington to give up his claims, which the Pope with irreverent humor called a "*coup*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

d'état of the Lord God," the machinations of Mgr. Talbot of the Pope's household to defeat others and advance Manning,—are not the whole wire-pulling and Tammany tactics clearly displayed in this marvellous biography? And yet at the end Manning could say that his appointment was a direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost in the mind of the Holy Father! If so, the Holy Ghost works by exceedingly unworthy instruments and by most disreputable methods. But the Pope spoke, no matter how induced thereto, or by what disregard and defiance of another's rights. And so God spoke, and Manning was Archbishop of Westminster by direct inspiration!

The Moderate party was now in complete despair and subjection in England, and all who favored it—especially the converts like Newman—were denounced by their fellow-converts as disloyal Catholics. That illustrious man was kept in retirement, which was virtual disgrace, for forty years; and Manning, who either intellectually or spiritually was not worthy to unloose the latchet of his shoes, helped to keep him down and out of sight. When Newman wanted to have an Oratory at Oxford where Roman Catholic students could reside and be influenced during a university course, no stone was left unturned to prevent him. He must not have too much influence over the educated young Catholics and they must be educated dogmatically, apart from Anglicans. And during Manning's episcopate no Roman Catholics were allowed to go to Oxford. He did not care to appear in opposition and tried to show that he was not, but Newman asserted that he was, and that he allowed his *entourage* to do the work without rebuke. When Manning in 1867 wanted to get into relations with Newman (seeing that the absolute separation was damaging to the Catholic cause as indicating division in the Church) Newman wrote him frankly that he distrusted him and could not get over his distrust. He said pointedly that there was no short cut to a restoration of confidence, but that new deeds only could reverse the old. Manning answered with a *tu quoque*, quoting Newman's words to him: "I have felt you difficult to understand and that your words have not prepared me for your acts." The upshot of the correspondence was a final brief note from Newman saying to Manning: "I do not know whether I am on my head or my heels when I have active relations with you. In spite of my friendly feelings, this is the judgment of my intellect." This terminated all intercourse for years.

The conduct of Manning when Newman was, after the accession of Leo XIII, made a cardinal, was most dishonorable and reprehensible.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It showed emphatically that his dogmatic and ecclesiastical conversion was accompanied by a distinct moral degeneration. The offer of the cardinal's hat was made as some reparation for long personal neglect. It indicated, however, a complete change of policy at the Vatican. It was not only a recognition of Newman's services, but an imprimatur of his tone and position. To Ward and Manning this was most unwelcome and altogether unbearable. No effort must be left unattempted to frustrate the offer. But Manning's position at Rome had changed with the death of Pius IX. The English Catholic laity insisted, and Manning had to be the composer and bearer of the petition of the Duke of Norfolk and Lord Petre to the Holy Father. This did not, however, prevent machinations to thwart the success of his own mission. Newman's answer to the proposal expressed great joy and appreciation of this mark of favor; he said nothing could induce him to decline it unless it involved unfaithfulness to St. Philip Neri, in whose honor the Oratory at Birmingham was founded and from which at his age he could not endure to be separated. This was intended as a hint to the Pope to allow him to retain as cardinal the position he had heretofore held.

Manning chose to interpret it as declining the proffer. He had been entrusted with the document to convey it to Rome, and it was confidential and not to be read or spoken of save by Cardinal Nina to whom it was addressed at the Vatican. At Paris Manning read the letter, let its contents, according to his interpretation of it, transpire, and authorized a publication in the newspapers saying that Newman had declined the proffered honor. This was a last endeavor to force the Pope's hand into a withdrawal of the proffer. But the Catholic laity and other clerical friends of Newman were fully aroused. The declination was as publicly denied. Newman himself wrote a dignified but indignant letter to the Duke of Norfolk (who among others had started the movement) showing that the statement could not have come from himself, who considered the suggestion sacred; nor from Rome, because the statement was made public before his letter reached Rome. He further said:—

> "It could only come, then, from some one who not only read my letter, but, instead of leaving *the Pope* to interpret it, took upon himself to put an interpretation upon it, and published that interpretation to the world. A private letter, addressed to the Roman authorities, is interpreted on its way and published in the English papers. How is it possible that any one can have done this?"

It was Cardinal Manning who had done all this, in violation of every sense of propriety and of just interpretation. But he had to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

repair and apologize for his mistake, and Cardinal Nina, after listening to Cardinal Manning's explanation, drily remarked that "the author was a better interpreter than another of his own words."

After Newman was made cardinal he met Cardinal Manning but twice, and that formally and but for a moment. When Newman died, Cardinal Manning, alone of the Roman Catholic bishops in England, was absent and unrepresented at the funeral. The event, however, occasioned too widespread an emotion to render silence or absence altogether possible. At a solemn dirge held at Brompton Oratory, Cardinal Manning read a carefully written and eloquent discourse. It was a just and not ungenerous tribute. But as his biographer records:—

"In the emotion of the moment Cardinal Manning, perhaps not unnaturally, forgot his prolonged opposition to Newman in Rome and in England; forgot his armed hostility and mistrust; forgot that for half a century from 1840 to 1890 he had not met or spoken to Newman more than half a dozen times. At Littlemore they met but once, and once at the Oratory in Birmingham. As cardinals they met but twice."

And yet in this public oration he represented—

"that he and Newman were knit together in the bonds of closest friendship for 'sixty years and more.' He forgot how utterly he had broken with Newman, saw as in a glass darkly only what he wished to see. At that supreme moment the not unnatural desire of Manning's heart was that his name should go forth before the world linked with that of Newman's as a life-long friend, and fellow-worker; that he might in a sense be a copartner in Newman's glory. . . . No act or effort was spared in the words spoken on that memorable occasion to create the impression which he wished to leave on the minds and imaginations of men. . . . In his illusion he saw only 'what might have been,' and not the things that were."

But "the things that were" have been told by Manning himself in his letters and acts, which showed the inner belief of his heart and the mature judgment of his mind. Yet not this belief and judgment will live in the minds and memories of men, but to the falsification of history illusion will take the place of reality, fiction of truth. What then is the truth? Cardinal Manning records it in an autobiographical note dated 1887. "If I was opposed to Newman, it was only because I had either to oppose Newman or to oppose the Holy See. I could not oppose the Pope."

The whole biography makes a most unpleasant impression of Cardinal Manning's *morale*. It is the impression of a man of strong natural powers, who was led by the lust of power all his days. His spiritual nature was not quickened by a longing and desire for "the vision and the faculty divine," but was roused and kept awake

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by fear. He dreaded what would happen should he neglect it. He never came to the sense of sonship which cries "Abba, Father." Before he was a Romanist he records in a diary in view of possible death: "Perhaps in that event I should be safest by a quasi-baptism." He proclaimed a complete confidence in the Church. He never seems to have had thorough confidence in God. Thus an honest and fearless uprightness never marked his ways. He might try to justify or explain his duplicity, but it was there to be justified and explained. He could condescend to intrigue with Odo Russell (the Protestant ambassador) and Mgr. Talbot, the papal chamberlain; to try every method of cajoling and persuading and entrapping men into formulating the decree of Papal Infallibility. Nothing came amiss which could insure success in that, and when success came, by whatever means, it was to him the triumph of God; yet a triumph by chicanery, the Holy Ghost speaking by profane lips; an infallible utterance secured in brilliant salons by flattering ladies, and won by social blandishments and the subtle tricks of electioneering politicians. In any other sphere of life such success would be called the triumph of evil by demagogues. Manning called this triumph of voices over the remonstrance of learning and reason, "the triumph of truth by the saints." To read his own account of the methods by which the end was gained serves to totally discredit the end to all except those who hold that in its final utterance a church council cannot err. To these no criticism of method is competent to deal with the result. If Divine Providence permits an utterance, then the utterance is divine. The external voice must silence the inner conviction.

The record of Manning's life as a Roman Catholic, together with the silent suggestions of Newman's career, throws great light on the interior life of the ecclesiastical communion into which they were led by such different gates. They seemed to be entering an ideal country whose air would breathe ennobling peace. They came upon discords as harsh as those they had left, a disheartening counterfeit of what they sought. They had breathed an ampler air than that of the region they entered. The atmosphere of nationality had encompassed them as Anglicans, and the aspirations of a Church had lent dignity to their strife. They came upon a household which, with all its pretensions, in England shared the spirit of a sect. Compared with the broader spirit of the Establishment, the Roman Catholic Church in England, few in numbers, uninfluential in the state, sluggish in its religious life, and split into discordant and petty factions, seemed a contracted place, more like

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a bear garden than the garden of Paradise they had dreamed of. Newman, if he had been allowed, would have raised the tone of its life by imparting the broad culture he brought with him to its rising youth, by associating its members with the life of the nation in its universities and public movements. Manning would rather raise its tone and awaken its enthusiasm by sharpening its contrasts with the prevailing life, deepening and intensifying the sect spirit by making it more Roman and less English. The one would raise it as the leaven, breathing into it a loftier spiritual tone and devotion and a higher intellectual conception; the other would make it felt as an institution, by making it less national and more papal. The strife which they found in their new ecclesiastical home soon penetrated their own ranks. The converts were divided into two hostile camps. Ward and Manning were as defiant of Newman as ever the most recalcitrant Anglican bishop had been. There was cessation of intercourse and bitter opposition. The spirit which had denied any flexibility of doctrinal definition in the English Church was now rampant against any moderation of view or practice, which it called disloyal Catholicism. Conversion had not brought peace among the converted, but a sword. Newman would rule by submission; Manning would rule by reconstruction. The one would create a Catholic university; the other equip and organize a Catholic army. But all of them found a rough field to be subdued instead of smooth paths to be trod. Relief must be sought in some endeavor to quicken in some direction the body they had deemed tingling with life.

Disillusion accounts for much in Manning's fierce energy to bring the Church up to what he had conceived it already to be. This called forth into supreme exercise his choicest powers, and opened for him a sphere of ambition wholly congenial to his nature. He was not slow to enter it. His great success attests his natural ability and reveals the kind of unity which is to be realized in Rome. In comparison with the dissensions of Protestantism, the bitter discords in the Roman camp are like a blare of trumpets to the murmur of flutes. There is an external unity of law, but a dissonance of thought and purpose which the most divergent sects of Protestantism cannot equal. The unity is the unity of the letter which killeth, not that of the spirit which giveth life. Submission to authority is its keynote, not the kindly cooperation of varying forces toward one great end. Thus with the eye of the ecclesiastical politician Manning strove, and strove successfully, to strengthen the central power, and, in the elevation of the Pope, to discredit and depress the episcopate, and by force of will rather than of reason to rule

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the world in the interests of a divine kingdom. When might makes right his ideal will be realized, but not till then.

Manning's career as archbishop and as cardinal shows also that, while his natural powers were intensified and expanded by his conversion, his moral nature was not elevated by it. In fact there are numerous signs of spiritual degeneration. He became more unscrupulous in his methods, more malignant in his animosities, more daring in his ambition. Anglicanism had kept him in check; Romanism gave him a loose rein. It was the exercise of his less spiritual and less amiable characteristics that secured his triumphs. And these too were in the realm of the temporal, not of the eternal.

But Manning was not only a theologian and an ecclesiastic, he was also a philanthropist, and in forming an estimate of the man and of his service it were grossly unfair to fail to note his efforts for the amelioration of the poor of London. His nature had never been gross and his ecclesiastical life made him an ascetic. He drank nothing, he ate almost nothing. To totally abstain from wine was as consonant to his inclination as to be drunken and gluttonous to others. He could thus command the attention and respect of the masses as one who urged them to the discipline he himself observed. And from one point to another along the line of social reform he moved with ever-ascending influence and power. His career in this phase of his life found its root in his Anglican life and is no special product of his Roman convictions. His biography is not specially remarkable for its delineation of it, but it is known and read of all men. Hath it not been published in the "Times"? It is none the less worthy for that. It is a softening and ennobling rounding-out of a tumultuous life which happily left ecclesiastical politics for social reform. His career as philanthropist was occasioned by the obscuration of his career as an ecclesiastical politician. The death of Pius IX threw a dark shadow across his path. It was a wonderful overturn for one who had been chief councillor at the Vatican to receive, as he did in 1886, from the editor of an influential paper conducted by the Jesuits, a message saying: "I am directed henceforth not to mention the name of Cardinal Manning with praise." And why? He had modified his view of the temporal power of the Pope, which earlier he had advocated with such violence as to intimate that it might become a *dogma de fide*.

After the success of the Italian Government, he wished it to be so far recognized as to have a strong Catholic delegation sent to the Italian parliament. There was profound statesmanship in the suggestion, but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Jesuits in Rome henceforth regarded him as a renegade. This change in Manning arose from the same innate tendency to recognize and fall in with a successful movement which had all his life animated him. It spoiled his career in the Roman Church, as his temporizing had discredited him when an Anglican. His great energies were however not to be suppressed. He turned them with renewed vigor into the channel of social reform. There was in this a mixture of ecclesiastical policy with the sentiment of humanity; but his services to temperance, to the rescue of poor children from ignorance and vice, to a sound education of the clergy, to the wrongs of the employed, to most of the more pressing social problems of the time, were most beneficent. He recognized that all such reforms in England, could they be associated with the Roman Church, would buttress its claims, give it prestige with the masses, and recognition by the classes; and this strong ecclesiastical motive added intensity to his endeavors. The ends thus sought were in a measure gained, and they were gained by activities in behalf of the needy and oppressed, which were worthy of all praise and associate with his name an enthusiasm for humanity far more to his credit than the enthusiasm for ecclesiastical despotism which marked most of his career.

It is well in the interests of charity to dwell on these later years, devoted to efforts worthy the imitation of all Christian men. They explain the enthusiasm with which he came to be regarded in life, and the respect which was manifested by the vast concourse of the people of London who attended or witnessed his funeral solemnities. But as his entrance into the ministry at first was the effect of disappointment in his early political aspirations, so this better side of his activity was the result of his disappointed ecclesiastical ambition. It was, however, a noble recoil and exhibits the best side of the man, as his sermons do, being the practical, as his sermons were the intellectual, outflow of his spiritual nature, which, however dominated or perverted by ambition, never died out nor even slumbered long. Ambition made him archbishop and cardinal. These were the crowns bestowed by temporal powers, worldly rewards for worldly services, albeit for the Church—and these the Church could give. But that by which he will be held in grateful recollection is not the splendid prize he coveted so eagerly and sought so long, but what he gave of sympathy and service to the necessities of his lowly fellow men.

C. C. Tiffany.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUBSTITUTES FOR THE SALOON.

THE hold of the saloon on the community does not proceed wholly, or perhaps chiefly, from the thirst for drink. The number of patrons of a saloon who are slaves of the drink-habit is relatively small. The saloon primarily satisfies the social instinct. It is the poor man's club. Club-life has become a social factor of rapidly increasing importance in all strata of modern society. It meets a demand felt both in the country and the city, and by women as well as by men. A very large proportion of those people who have the most abundant resources in their homes now spend many of their leisure hours in one or another form of social club. But when the poor man is moved by the social instinct which satisfies itself in club-life, where is he to go? He returns from his benumbing work to his squalid home, craving the company of his mates and a warm, bright spot amid the dulness of his routine; and these resources of change of scene and recreation which more favored persons find in their club he finds most naturally and conveniently in the saloon.

As competition between saloons increases, the line of competition testifies how much of their patronage depends on their satisfying the social instincts. Contributions to sociability are multiplied. There are added to the mere sale of liquor at the bar, entertainments, music, the baseball score, the racing news, the pool-table, the kinetoscope,—not as sources of direct profit, but simply to make the saloon more sociable and an agreeable centre of the evening's gossip, curiosity, and excitement. No attack on the saloon can be permanently successful which does not take into account this satisfaction of the social instinct. It has been said that the most valuable invention which could just now be made for the welfare of the human race would be the invention of an attractive and innocuous drink. It might be still further said that the most important step which could at this moment be taken in temperance reform would be the satisfaction of the social instinct without the accompanying risk of intoxicating liquor. It becomes of interest therefore to inquire how much has been done for this form of social satisfaction. Is there at present any considerable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

competition with the saloons as means of sociability? How far have we been successful in devising social substitutes for the saloon?

In order to make some approach to an answer to this question a twofold inquiry was made in Boston, Massachusetts, during the summer of 1895, in behalf of the Committee of Fifty for the Investigation of the Liquor Problem.[1] On the one hand has been estimated the average daily patronage of the saloons of that city; and on the other hand the average daily patronage of such resorts as could be fairly described as social substitutes for the saloon. By daily patronage is meant in both cases the number of persons entering. If the same person entered more than once he was counted each time. In the table, on another page, there is presented in the first column the approximate population of the city, grouped by Police Divisions. This classification and other statistics of population have been generously provided by the Chief of the State Bureau of Statistics, Mr. Horace G. Wadlin. In the third and fourth columns appear the facts concerning the licensed saloons of the city and their estimated daily patronage. These columns are based on the evidence of the Boston police, and were procured, in behalf of this inquiry, by order of the Police Commissioners.

This evidence as to the saloons was obtained as follows: Each patrolman was called on for his impressions as to the probable daily patronage of the saloons on his beat, and his judgment was in doubtful cases fortified by the evidence of the saloon-keepers themselves. These returns were then checked and tabulated by the captains of Police Divisions and reported to the Commissioners. Finally, at the office of the Commissioners a complete table was prepared and put at the service of this investigation. Thus, the figures as to the saloons, while not attempting strict accuracy, are probably as near the truth as is attainable. The other columns of the table, representing the existing substitutes for the saloon in Boston, are the result of a special and independent investigation. The entire city has been patrolled and

[1] The Committee of Fifty represents different communities and occupations and is engaged in the study of the liquor problem, in the hope of securing a body of facts which will serve as a basis for intelligent public and private judgment. Its officers are: Seth Low, President; Charles Dudley Warner, Vice-President; Francis G. Peabody, Secretary; William E. Dodge, Treasurer; John S. Billings, Chairman of Physiological Committee; Charles W. Eliot, Chairman of Legislative Committee; Jacob L. Greene, Chairman of Ethical Committee; Francis A. Walker, Chairman of Economic Committee. All reports made to these committees are to be regarded as preliminary in their nature and as contributions to any general conclusion which may be in the future reached by the Committee as a whole.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inspected by an agent of the Committee of Fifty, and a letter from the Police Commissioner to the Division Captains has opened many doors.

The scope of investigation both by the police and by the present inquiry has been strictly limited. It is not a study of all the drinking-places of the city, or of all the influences which counteract drinking. It considers only the saloons and the substitutes for them. By "saloons" is meant only the licensed bar-rooms of the city, leaving out of account all resorts where drinking may be regarded as an accessory, as, for instance, hotels, private clubs holding licenses, and licensed grocers. By "substitutes for the saloon" is meant only such resorts as appear to compete directly with the bar-rooms by offering to those who might be their patrons some degree of sociability without drink. A vast amount of drinking must therefore be added to the figures here given for any adequate picture of the drink-habit in Boston; and, on the other hand, it should be remembered that there are many forms of competition with the saloon which the present inquiry excludes because they do not contribute to the satisfaction of sociability. The number of patrons of each such substitute for the saloons is based on estimates, or rather on guesses, verified by various kinds of evidence,—the judgment of patrolmen, or of customers, or of proprietors,—and is likely in some instances to have been overestimated by interested persons, or in some instances to have been understated for some supposed advantage to be gained. In particular, it may be doubted whether pool-rooms are fairly to be reckoned as substitutes for the saloon in the sense of being on the whole more elevating resorts than bar-rooms. Some adjoin bar-rooms or are opposite to them, so that, as one proprietor remarked, men may play between drinks. Some, on the other hand, are in their way substitutes for saloons, and at least permit sociability to exist without drink. These pool-rooms are therefore included in the table, but are set in a column by themselves.

Turning, then, to the examination of the table, several indications of general importance seem to be at once suggested.

1. The first fact made plain, even by statistics confessedly lacking in accuracy, is the prodigious dimensions of the drink-habit. According to the Census of 1895, the city of Boston contains 496,920 inhabitants, men, women, and children. It appears therefore, according to the best judgment procurable, based on the daily and almost hourly observation of patrolmen, that an army equal to about half the entire population of the city, or no less than 226,752 persons, patronizes the bars of the city every day. This estimate, as has been said, reckons

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUBSTITUTES FOR THE SALOON IN THE CITY OF BOSTON. 1895.

Police Divisions.	Population (Approx.)	Number of Saloons.	Daily Patronage.	Arrests Drunks Daily.	Pool Rooms.	Daily Patronage.	Coffee Rooms.	Daily Patronage. *	Lunch Rooms.	Daily Patronage.	Reading Rooms.	Daily Patronage.	Clubs.	Daily Patronage.
1	22,288	99	36,600	18	21	2,000	..	.....	20	6,000	4	300	4	175
2	10,970	72	39,240	2.5	11	1,800	3	7,650	35	15,225	..	.....	..	....
3	25,070	63	21,385	11	17	1,500	3	2,400	14	3,200	1	?	2	115
4	12,244	89	36,045	13	28	2,500	4	3,200	27	9,965	3	1,800	..	....
5	52,809	63	28,350	4.5	49	3,900	4	1,200	20	3,350	4	320	14	700
6	29,555	53	15,260	5	15	2,200	9	100	3	300	1	50	..	....
7	39,995	27	7,020	4	12	1,000	2	350	35	1,375	2	120	10	550
8	2,600	..	.....	....	*Harbor Police. No Report.*						..	.....	..	....
9	51,798	23	6,875	3.5	7	750	..	.....	10	1,200	2	50	5	220
10	44,171	50	16,000	7	23	2,700	1	50	49	5,500	4	150	2	200
11	42,004	3	600	1.5	6	700	..	.....	..	.....	4	175	5	125
12	35,828	14	4,350	2	6	500	..	.....	3	200	..	.....	1	35
13	36,116	6	900	1	3	450	..	.....	..	.....	2	60	2	55
14	15,001	6	900	2	1	150	..	.....	1	50	3	150	4	100
15	40,304	38	13,227	5	26	2,500	3	428	10	1,200	2	150	7	225
16	36,167	..	.....	?	..	.....	..	.....	..	.....	3	7,500	..	....
Total	496,920	606	226,752	80	225	22,650	29	15,378	227	47,565	35	10,825	56	2,500

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

each patron every time he enters. The number of distinct drinkers is, therefore, reduced by the large number of repeaters. There is to be reckoned, moreover, in this great multitude, the very large number of drinkers in Boston who are residents of other towns, and especially in adjacent towns under a no-license policy. On the other hand, this over-estimate of the drink-habit among residents is in a large degree corrected when we recall the many resorts not here enumerated where residents daily drink. Whether the patronage by city-dwellers of the bars of hotels, the private licensed clubs, the licensed grocers, and the unlicensed resorts is sufficient to balance the bar-room drinking by non-residents, is a question inviting to speculation. It is at any rate a sufficiently serious fact that, wherever the patronage comes from, it pours at such a rate into the Boston saloons.

Calculation becomes interesting as to the amount of money which this patronage contributes to the saloons, and various competent judges have been consulted as to the average amount spent by each patron at each visit. Some experts regard eight cents as a probable average; but the balance of opinions leans to the belief that the average patron does not escape without spending ten cents. If this estimate be not excessive then there is daily spent in the Boston saloons the sum of $22,675, or in a year of three hundred days the prodigious sum of $6,802,500; or an annual gross income of about $10,000 for each of the 606 saloons. The total running expenses of the Boston public-school system for 1894–95 was $2,061,160. The total expense of the Boston Fire Department for the same year was $1,041,296. The total bill for the Police Department was $1,318,186. The total expense for the city park system was $2,241,814. All these formidable expenditures taken together amount to a smaller sum than was spent during the same year in the bar-rooms of the city. A comparison with the living expenses of the manual-labor class is equally instructive. The sum of money paid over the Boston bars, nine tenths of which—it may be fairly estimated—comes from persons of modest incomes, is sufficient to meet the total living expenses of nearly 11,700 families spending $600 a year each. According to the Census of 1895, there are in Boston 103,306 families. How many of these families have their incomes encroached upon by expenditures in the saloon, is a question impossible to answer; for the saloon-habit affects all classes and in degrees not open to computation. If, however, we estimate that of the total of families in the city one quarter, or 25,000 families, are thus more or less affected, and if we conceive that these families,—the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great proportion of which are of the wage-earning class,—have an average income of $1000, then each of these 25,000 families is taxed about $272 a year by the bar-room; or, in other words, more than one fourth of the income of 25,000 families is now consumed by the drink-habit. Such considerations, though they do not touch the question of moral or domestic degeneration, indicate something of the relation of drink to wages and the possible surplus already available to wage-earners in city life.

Again, there are in Boston, approximately, 239,666 male residents; but of these, 83,136 are under twenty years of age and therefore by law excluded from the saloons. Of males above twenty years there are 156,530; so that the patronage of the Boston saloons is as if every man in the city drank every day, and in addition treated a friend from the country every other day. The distribution of the drink-habit is also instructive. The Police Divisions may be roughly grouped in three classes. In Divisions 1–4 (North End, Down Town, West End, Lower Washington Street,) the daily patronage of the saloons amounts on the whole to nearly double the entire population of the Divisions (133,270 drinkers for 70,572 residents); and there are maintained no less than 323 bar-rooms, or more than one half the saloons for less than one seventh of the population. This disproportion is due, in Divisions 1 and 3, in part to the daily movement to and from the Union station; in Division 4 to the great thoroughfares and the movement to and from the Southern stations; and in Division 2 to the great tide of business life flooding into the State Street region every day and ebbing away at night. Yet, even with these interpretations, which give some reasonableness to the situation in Divisions 2 and 4, the conditions of Divisions 1 and 3 seem unendurable; these adjoining districts with a joint population of 47,358 supporting 162 bar-rooms, or nearly one fourth of the saloons of the city for less than one tenth of the population; and providing three eighths of the city's total arrests for drunkenness. It has, moreover, appeared in the course of this inquiry that, at least in Division 1, a very small proportion of these arrests are of residents of the Division. That is to say, the region is burdened with a traffic which its own population does not demand.

A second group is made of Divisions 5 (Upper Washington Street), 6 (West End of South Boston), and 15 (Charlestown), where the estimated daily drinking is approximately one half the total population. Both these latter regions are outlying parts of the city and both are gradually but surely losing their native population. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

saloon patronage of Charlestown is in some degree due to migration to and from suburban towns and to the large warehouses and freight stations of the district. South Boston, on the other hand, is a pocket in the city's outline. There is little migration to or through it. Its drinking has to be done by its own residents, and, further, a great number of these residents migrate for the day into the city, and do only their evening drinking in South Boston. Thus, the figures for South Boston seem quite worthy to be ranked with the first group, and in their indication of the habits of the residents appear as serious as in any Division. Throughout the rest of the city (Divisions 7–14, 16), being the region of homes, the drink patronage is relatively insignificant in comparison with the population. In Division 16 (Back Bay) there are no licensed saloons, and in Division 11 (Dorchester) there are but three saloons, with a patronage of 600 in a population of 42,004. Thus the liquor-trade is a highly concentrated form of business, with the advantages and disadvantages of being set along main thoroughfares and in a limited section of the city, more than half the daily arrests for drunkenness (44.5) occurring in a region containing less than one seventh of the population (70,572).

2. The second fact which is illustrated by the table is of a more encouraging nature. We observe that substitutes for the saloon already exist in Boston in considerable numbers and have a reasonable degree of attractiveness. Summing up all the resorts enumerated, the total average daily patronage is approximately 98,918, or, without pool-rooms, 76,268; so that it may not unreasonably be affirmed that the proportion of attendance is as 1 to 2.5. It is to be noticed also that while the patronage of the saloon is greatly increased by non-resident drinkers, the patronage of the substitutes for saloons, being for the most part in the evening, is almost wholly of city-dwellers, so that the proportion of attendance, considered only as among residents, becomes still more favorable for the "substitutes." When one considers the inadequacy of many of these resorts, their meagre provision for sociability and comfort as compared with the splendor of the saloons, and the disadvantage under which some of these substitutes are put, by regarding sociability as secondary to moral or religious influence, one may be encouraged to believe that the desire among working people for the satisfaction of the social instinct, without the compulsion to drink liquor, must be serious and general. Some of these would-be substitutes for the saloon are cheerless and barren, some are slightly disguised prayer-meetings and missionary enter-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prises, but the patronage received under present conditions, and especially the success of a few enterprises which have no other end than sociability, should give reasonable encouragement to those who care for this flank attack on the saloon.

3. Again, this study brings to light both points of special need and movements of special promise. Two regions are exhibited as at the same time infested by saloons and lacking in sufficient substitutes. These are the North End (Division 1) and the West End of South Boston (Division 6). Division 1 is not lacking in devoted missionary enterprises (the Epworth Settlement, the North End Mission, the North End Union, the Baptist Bethel, the Seaman's Friend Society); and there are also, among Salem Street and North Street Italians and Jews, many praiseworthy little ventures of their own for the sale of the lighter drinks. The mixed character of the population involves special difficulties in devising plans of sociability, and the existing missionary efforts deserve high praise. Taking the Division as a whole, however, and remembering that its population is almost without exception of the class least able to resist the saloon influence, the region seems simply crushed under its burden of 99 saloons, and gravely needs new accessions of rational recreation. Division 6 is less overwhelmed with saloons, but also less leavened by undertakings of a wholesome social nature. It seems to be a neglected region, very barren of elevating influence, as it stands somewhat apart from the movement of city-life. There is a Coffee-room of the Episcopal Church Temperance Society; there is a branch of the Public Library; and there are a few social clubs. But the Protestant population is declining and shifting and the Catholic clergy do not seem to have realized the serious inroads of the saloon upon their people. Here then appear to be regions demanding on the one hand special limitation of saloons by the Licensing Board, and offering on the other hand a special field for private enterprises which are looking for the greatest social need.

This comprehensive examination brings to light also local and modest enterprises, which have gone far to leaven certain regions of the city, and which should be carefully studied as indicating, under certain conditions, the best lines of action. Very marked instances of such success are to be found in East Boston (Division 8), in the East Boston Athletic Association; in the very notable work of the Charlesbank Gymnasium (Division 3); in the Wells Memorial Institute (Division 3) and a number of clubs organized and maintained in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that Division by various groups of working-men; and in Division 10 (Roxbury), in the People's Institute, with its 900 members, and the Boys' Institute of Instruction, with its 300 boys and girls. Many of these organizations are in large degree self-governed, and all are directly devoted to the healthier activity of body or of mind, or both. An attempt has been made in connection with this inquiry to consider the popular theatres of the city as social substitutes for the saloon, but this is a matter where conclusions may vary from week to week. A theatre for the poor—as for the rich—may on one day be giving the most satisfactory and on another the most nauseating performance. It is evident, however, that such theatres, which attract, as a rule, crowded audiences, may make a very important part of such social substitution, and it is at the present time apparently true that while some of the cheap theatres are distinctly degrading, there are some, and very profitable ones, where the performance is distinctly more moral in tone than in much of the modern drama; and where it has been discovered that excitement and enthusiasm can be stimulated without indecency.

4. To this indication of points of danger and lines of action should be added another fact which such a study discloses. It is the lack of unity among the agencies which are now offering substitutes for the saloon. The saloons, though competitors with each other, are united by the strongest ties, and against hostile influences are massed as an army. The substitutes for the saloons are little, scattered enterprises, —often of the most conscientious and generous nature,—but, in most instances, without even the slightest mutual alliance and in some instances without even the knowledge of each other's operations. For any rational progress in an attack on a thoroughly entrenched enemy, there should be an alliance of all the forces engaged—religious and secular, Catholic and Protestant; together with a careful division of fields of operation, and a reference of patrons from one resort, where a man may not be content, to another substitute for the saloon which might prove attractive.

5. Another inference to which such an examination naturally leads must be candidly stated. Considering, for the moment, nothing but the satisfaction of the social instinct, it seems plain that this end, to be gained, must be unmixed with purposes of missionary zeal. It is difficult for people who care supremely for religion to believe that it should be ruled out of any resort; yet the fact is that when in any substitute for the saloon the patron knows that he is likely to have a prayer-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meeting "sprung" on him, he is—unless he be "Gospel-hardened," or inclined to "work the piety-game"—in some degree repelled; just as a more cultivated man—even if religious—would rebel at the invasion of a prayer-meeting into his social club. This does not mean that a resort, openly religious, is of no service to the working-man and may not be a social as well as religious influence. There are, no doubt, men who are strengthened and restrained by such positive expressions of faith as they would be in no other way. The temperance mission and church coffee-house have their own good work to do. But they are not primarily a form of club or saloon; they are primarily a form of church. In a genuine poor-man's club—as in a rich-man's club—visible signs of religious intention must be eliminated. The fact is that in temperance, as in scientific charity, we are called upon to recognize the deeper and unostentatious place of religious influence in social reform. It inspires and directs philanthropic service, but it does not make of philanthropy an instrument of propagandism. To deny to philanthropy the technical expressions of religion does not banish religion from philanthropy. It only sees in philanthropy itself a direct and sufficient expression of religious consecration and desire.

6. Finally, in the city of Boston—and under their own conditions in other great cities—certain checks on the saloon seem to be suggested by the present inquiry.

(*a*) It appears, for instance, that, quite apart from proposed changes in the law, the law as it now exists is rarely strictly enforced, and perhaps in many of its regulations is not often understood. Sellers of liquor, not infrequently, do not know the conditions of the law under which their trade is permitted. The opponents of the saloon, on the other hand, are often unaware of the serviceable, even if imperfect, weapon which is even now ready to their hands in the long series of restrictions with which the law, as it exists, surrounds the liquor-traffic. It is not even certain that the patrolmen, whose duty it is to enforce the law, could pass an examination on its multifarious conditions as to hours, screens, doors, windows, and licenses; and it would be of service to distribute a cheap compilation of existing liquor-laws among the police and the charity-workers of the city.

(*b*) Another important and just check on the saloon evil would be effected if the license-system were administered in connection with more limited districts. Under the present law the total population of the city regulates the number of saloons—there being not more than one saloon to 500 of population—but these saloons are set where the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commissioners may determine, it being assumed that, on the whole, the maximum number shall be permitted in the entire city. Thus, simply because one part of the city is unprofitable to the saloon, all the more saloons are planted among the most largely-tempted classes. The very fact, that is to say, that some regions are respectable, increases the chance of degradation in less fortunate districts.

The Back Bay wants no saloons and Dorchester supports but 3, but this immunity practically compels the North End to maintain the shocking number of 99. If the unit of assignment were the Division or the Ward, instead of the city, the total of saloons would be enormously decreased, with no loss of convenience to the drinkers and no radical change in the basis of assignment. The only loss would be a corresponding part of the license-fees; and to the principle which involves this form of loss the voters have already consented by establishing the 1 to 500 proportion.

(*c*) With this change of the basis of assignment there would become possible a further restriction gravely and obviously needed,—a reasonable separation of saloons from one another. Nothing seems to the average observer more preposterous in the present assignment of licenses than the licensing of a half dozen saloons next-door to each other, or even of a street of bar-rooms like Eliot Street between Park Square and Tremont Street. The method, however, under the present system, may be reasonably defended. If there must be in the city not less than 606 saloons it may be better to set them near together, along thoroughfares and under easy police supervision. But from the point of view of public convenience one saloon properly placed is as good as six, and for public safety it is much better. Thus, while in the strictly business portion of the city (Division 2) an exception might have to be made, because of the slight resident population, the general welfare would be much more consulted by breaking up the threatening groups of superfluous saloons, and distributing half the number on the basis of local population and local demands.

(*d*) A more radical step in restriction would be taken if under the principle of local option the whole question of licenses could become a question for independent determination within each Police Division or Ward. It is evident that in some parts of Boston the abolition of the saloon would lead to evils at least comparable with its existence. It is equally evident that, in other parts of the city, even the few saloons which do exist, are licensed in opposition to the overwhelming sentiment of the voters. Thus it seems reasonable that the interests of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

different regions in a great city should have independent consideration and expression; and the result which would ensue, and which is even now in a large degree attained, of fixing the liquor business in special limited regions, would be, with all its terrible evils, on the whole a further advantage in the direction of supervision and restraint.

Such are some of the limitations on the drink traffic which may commend themselves to an observer of conditions of city-life; and such reasonable checks would tend to give the substitutes for the saloons a fair chance to compete. The saloon is a degrading form of social enjoyment, but it is a real form. It offers so much to the life of the poor that at least one skilled observer in Boston has remarked, in the course of this investigation, that if it were a question between the saloon and no poor-man's club he would wish the saloon to stay. The substitute for the saloon, in order to survive, must give more resources of sociability than the saloon gives, and compete with it on its own terms. There must be no hint of patronage or of missionary zeal. There must be the same tone which prevails in the rich-man's club,—a sense of proprietorship, a comfort which tempts to patronage, resources of athletic life, games which are of real interest, literature which is not discarded rubbish of the benevolent, light and liberty, and self-government; and for this form of institution there are already among the working-classes obvious and often pathetic signs of long-suffering expectation and desire.

FRANCIS G. PEABODY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IS THERE ANOTHER LIFE?

THE appearance of a portly and learned volume by the Rev. Dr. Salmond on "The Christian Doctrine of Immortality" shows the anxious interest which has been awakened in these questions. His treatment of the subject also recognizes the necessity which is felt of perfectly free though reverent inquiry, as our sole way of salvation amidst the perplexities—theological, social, and moral,—in which we are involved. For himself, he unreservedly accepts the Christian revelation. Christianity, he is so happy as to believe, "has translated the hope of immortality from a guess, a dream, a longing, a probability, into a certainty, and has done this by interpreting us to ourselves and confirming the voice of prophecy within us." But he subjects the sacred records of Christianity to critical examination. He does not talk effete orthodoxy to an age of reason. Nor does he rest upon the evidence of Revelation alone. He endeavors to combine with it that of Manifestation as presented by reason and history.

The change made by Darwin's great discovery—as, with all rights of modification reserved, it may surely be called,—in our notions regarding the origin of our species could not fail to stimulate curiosity as to its destiny. We held, it is true, before Darwin that man had been formed out of the dust; in that respect our ideas have undergone no change. It is true also that whatever our origin may have been, and through whatever process we may have gone, we are what we are, none the less for Darwin's discovery; while the fact that we have risen from the dust or from the condition of the worm instead of leading us to despair ought rather to inspire us with hope. Still, before Darwin we rested in the belief that man had been called into existence by a separate creation, in virtue of which he was a being apart from all other animals, and this belief has by Darwin been dispelled. A being apart from the other animals man remains in virtue of his reason, of which other animals have, at most, only the rudiments, and yet more perhaps in virtue of his aspirations and his capacity for improvement, of which even the most intelligent of the other animals, so far as we can see, have no share. He alone is consciously moral, he alone is religious;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he alone is speculative, looking before and after; he alone feels the influence of beauty and expresses his sense of it in poetry and art; what is lust in brutes in him alone is love; he alone thinks or dreams that there is in him anything that ought not to die. Yet Darwin's discovery has effaced the impassable line which we took to have been drawn by a separate creation between man and the beasts which perish.

Science, moreover, Darwinian and general, has put an end to the traditional belief in the soul as a being separate from the body, breathed into the body by a distinct act of the Creator, pent up in it as in a prison-house, beating spiritually against the bars of the flesh and looking to be set free by death. Soul and body, we now know, are indivisible from each other, man's nature being one, enfolded at first in the same embryo, advancing in all its parts and aspects through the same stages to maturity, and succumbing at last to the same decay. Not that this makes our nature more material in the gross sense of that term. Spirituality is an attribute of moral elevation and aspiration, not of the composition of the organism. Tyndall called himself a "materialist," yet no man was ever less so in the gross sense. If we wish to see clearly in these matters it might be almost better for a time to suspend our use of the word "soul," with its traditional connotation of antagonism to the body, and to speak only of the higher life or of spiritual aim and effort.

We have moreover in approaching these questions to clear our minds entirely of geocentricism, theological and philosophical as well as physical, of our notions of this earth as the centre of the universe and the grand scene of providential action, and at the same time of the ideas of our religious infancy about the Mosaic beginning and the Apocalyptic end of things. We have wholly to banish the creations of Milton's fancy, so strongly impressed upon our imaginations, as well as the Ptolemaic cosmography, and think no more of a heaven above and an earth below, with angels ascending and descending between them, or of a court of heaven looking down upon the earth. We must float out in thought into a universe without a centre, without limit, without beginning or end, of which all that we see on a starlight night is but a point, in which we ourselves are but living and conscious atoms. There has been much debate among religious thinkers about the origin of evil. But evil, it would seem, can have no origin, since the universe has none, and evil, or what to us seems evil, as well as good, is a part of the constitution of the universe. To

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fathom the mystery of the universe—that is, the mystery of existence, —we cannot hope. Of eternity and infinity we can form no notion; we can think of them only as time and space extended without limit, a conception which involves a metaphysical absurdity, since of space and time we must always think as divisible into parts, while of infinity or eternity there can be no division. The thought of eternal existence, even of a life of eternal happiness, if we dwell upon it, turns the brain giddy: it is a sort of mental torture to dwell upon the idea.

The doctrine of a future life with rewards for the good and punishment for the wicked, as we all know, pervades the New Testament. That this world is evil, and Christians must look forward to a better world, is the teaching of the founder of Christianity and of all the Christian Churches. It could not fail to be fostered by the state of the world and especially of the subject provinces under the Roman Empire. The Christian martyrdoms are a signal testimony to the same belief. Yet the doctrine can hardly be said to be so distinctly stated in the New Testament as its overwhelming importance might have led us to expect. It is in fact rather assumed than stated. The passages concerning it are rather homiletic than dogmatic; they are enforcements of the infinite blessedness of piety and goodness, of the infinite curse attending wickedness, rather than enunciations of an article for a creed. Nor is anything explicitly said as to the manner in which the mortal is to put on immortality, or as to the state and occupations of the blessed in the next world. White robes, harps, palm branches, a city of gold and jewels, are not spiritual; they must be taken as material imagery; taken literally they provoke the derision of the sceptic.

Difficulties crowd upon us and severely tax the exegetical resources of Dr. Salmond. A sudden and absolute change of nature is contrary to all our experience, which would lead us to believe that gradual progress is the law. The disproportion of eternal rewards and punishments to the merits or sins of man's short life is profoundly repugnant to our moral sense. When we take in the cases of children, of savages, of the hapless offspring of the slums, of the heathen who have never heard the Word, the difficulty is immensely increased.

In all the churches there is now a revolt against the belief in eternal fire, which, nevertheless, if the Gospel is to be taken literally, it would seem impossible to avoid. Such a belief in fact can hardly be thought ever to have gained a practical hold on the mind; if it had, it would almost have dissolved humanity with terror. Nor is there in reality any such line of demarcation between the good and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wicked as that drawn in the homiletic language of the Gospel between the wheat and the tares, between the sheep and the goats, between those who enter by the wide and by the narrow gate. Between the extreme points of goodness and wickedness there are gradations of character in number infinite and fluctuating from hour to hour. The Roman Catholic Church tries to meet this difficulty by the invention of Purgatory, which, it is needless to say, is a creation of her own. In this case also the difficulty is enhanced when we take in children and those on whom circumstances have borne so hardly as almost to preclude volition. Nor are the passages in the Gospel concerning the future state, if pressed literally, altogether consistent with each other, at least with regard to the mode of the transition. The idea generally presented is that of a final judgment in which the good are to be separated from the wicked, the good entering into eternal joy, the wicked into eternal fire, and of a period of sleep or unconsciousness which is to last till the Judgment Day. But this is not consistent with the parable of Dives and Lazarus, with the preaching of Christ to the souls in prison, or with the words of Christ on the cross to the penitent thief. These variations become more important when we consider the unspeakably vital character of the doctrine. Resurrection of the body is an article of the creed. It presents insuperable difficulties: not only are the particles of the body dispersed, but they must often be incorporated into other bodies. Besides, is a babe to rise again a babe, and is an old man to rise with the body of old age? Devices for meeting such difficulties may be found; but they are devices and not solutions.

It is on the Christian revelation that our hope has hitherto rested. Butler, when he applies reason to the question of a future life, has revelation all the time in reserve. He professes not to offer independent proof of the doctrine, but merely to disarm Reason of the objections which she might urge against Revelation. Of independent proof, with deference be it said, he offers, not so much as, with our present scientific lights at all events, will amount even to a serious presumption. Assuming, after the fashion of his day, that the soul is a being apart from the body, he suggests that it may be a simple monad, indecerptible and therefore indestructible, or at least not presumably liable to dissolution when the body is dissolved. But we know that his presumption is unfounded, and that what he calls the soul is but the higher and finer activity of our general frame. He says that the faculties and emotions sometimes remain unaffected by mortal disease

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

even at the point of death. But they do not remain unaffected by a disease of the brain. His strongest point perhaps is the unbroken continuance of conscious identity notwithstanding the change of our bodily frame by the flux of its component particles, and in spite of sleep and fits of insensibility. But the flux of particles or the suspension of consciousness by sleep or a fainting fit is a different thing from total dissolution, such as takes place when the body moulders in the grave. Besides, the phenomenon is common to us with brutes, and the objection that this or any other of Butler's arguments would apply as well to brutes as to man is not to be evaded by calling it invidious. The great thinker would perhaps have seen this more clearly had he lived in the Darwinian age and been disenchanted of his belief in the special breathing of a soul into man. He is so far from our present point of view as to think that dreams are products of the mind acting apart from the bodily sense.

Of the two great thinkers of antiquity Plato believed intensely in a future life, for which this present life was but a training, and in a future state of rewards and punishments. His arguments, put into the mouth of Socrates, who is about to die, come to us in the most persuasive guise. But they are entangled with the fanciful tenets of preexistence, of knowledge as reminiscence from a previous state, and of the real existence of abstract ideas. They are based on the erroneous conception of the soul as an entity distinct from the body and imprisoned in it, so that, in the case at least of one who has kept his soul pure and healthy by philosophy and asceticism, death would be emancipation. The soul, Plato thinks, cannot be affected by diseases of the body, but only by its own diseases, ignorance and vice. An evidence of more weight practically than any of the metaphysical arguments adduced by the disciple of Socrates is the death of Socrates itself, which, like the Christian martyrdoms, implies a strong and rooted faith in the future reward of loyalty to truth and virtue. The same faith is expressed by Plato in the "Republic." To him amid the license of Athenian democracy in its hour of decay, as to the Christian amid the demoralization of the Roman Empire, the world seemed evil; and he found support for righteousness in the conviction that though the righteous man might suffer obloquy, persecution, and even a painful and shameful death in this life, it would be well for him in the sum of things. If there is a soul of the universe and if it holds communion in any way with the soul of man, such a belief would seem likely to be at least no mere hallucination.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In Aristotle's "Ethics" there is no trace of the doctrine, either in its specific form or in the form of faith in the ultimate triumph of virtue which it assumes in Plato. The fact is that virtue, in one sense of the word and as denoting obedience to a moral law, is hardly a term of Aristotle's system. His virtue is not so much obedience to a moral law as the functional activity of fully developed and perfectly balanced humanity, such as is presented with a rather statuesque dignity in his model character of the high-minded man (*megalopsychos*). All that he wants is a life sufficiently long for full development (*bios teleios*). Of compensation or retribution he seems to have no idea.

In the great Stoics, Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius, there is no expression of belief in a personal life beyond the present. What they seem to expect is absorption in the universe, which, if personality is merged, would be the extinction of our personal selves. On the other hand they show the profoundest faith in the divinity of the moral law, in the nothingness of present pleasures or pains, and in the infinite reward of virtue. Their asceticism—that of Marcus Aurelius on a throne—was a practical demonstration of their faith. In Seneca may be found a vague intimation of belief that death is a transition to a higher life, but Seneca is a rhetorician, not a philosopher.

A belief in the immortality of the soul has been a part of most of the religions, yet not of all. It is absent from the sacred books of the Hebrews, desperate as have been the efforts to import it into them; and bold as is the statement of Anglican Articles that both in the Old and the New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind through Christ. An exception such as that of the Hebrews, an eminently religious nation, is enough to bar any argument from universal consent, even if universal consent, where it can be explained by natural desire, were sufficient to prove a belief innate. The other world has often formed the lucrative domain of priests, who have pretended by mystic rites to provide the dying with a passport to celestial bliss. Egypt seems to have been preeminent in the definiteness of her belief and the minuteness of her mortuary ritual, while she was also strangely preeminent in the effort to protract the existence of the bodily tenement, showing thereby apparently an absence of belief in the separate existence of the soul. The Persian faith in a future life appears also to have been strong, though mixed with degrading absurdities which make it philosophically worthless. Buddhism is a philosophy rather than a religion, while upon any hypothesis as to the meaning of Nirvana, the hope of the Buddhist is not personal immortality but escape

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from personal existence. Be Nirvana what it may, it is a fancy, generated apparently by local causes, and offers nothing in the way of verification.

"The evidences of a future life, Sir, are sufficient," was Boswell's remark to Johnson. "I could wish for more, Sir," was Johnson's reply. It was no doubt his sense of the insufficiency of the evidences, considering the vital character of the doctrine, that disposed Johnson to belief in ghosts, and made him anxious to investigate all stories of the kind, even when they were so absurd as that of the ghost of Cock Lane. It cannot be necessary to discuss such fictions. The only case, so far as we are aware, in which there is anything like first-hand evidence is that of the warning apparition to Lord Lyttelton, which may be explained as the masked suicide of a voluptuary sated with life. Nor can spiritualistic apparitions call for notice. They have been often enough exposed. Nothing is proved by them but the fond credulity of bereavement pining for communion with the lost. Spiritualism, it should not be forgotten, had its farcical origin in table-turning. Apart from the miraculous resurrection of Christ, and Christ's miraculous raisings from the dead, no one has been seen or heard from after death. That evidence, which alone could be absolutely conclusive, has never been afforded. This is the stubborn fact with which Butler and those who adopt his line of argument have to contend.

Positivism hopes that it has indemnified, or more than indemnified, us for the loss of personal immortality by tendering an impersonal immortality in the consequences of our lives and actions prolonged through the generations which come after us to the end of time. But this immortality is not only impersonal, it is unconscious, and, therefore, so far as our sensations are concerned, not distinguishable from annihilation. It is not even specially human: we share it with every motor, animate or inanimate,—with the horse that draws a wagon, with the water that turns a mill, with the food which passes into the muscles of the consumer, with the falling stone.

Besides, all theories which pretend to console man for his mortality by making him a partaker in the immortality of his race, seem to encounter the objection that the race itself is not immortal. How long the planet which is the abode of man will last or remain fit for man's habitation, the oracles of science may not be agreed, but they appear to be agreed in holding that the end must come. If they are right, philosophy does but mock us when she bids us find our real spiritual life in efforts to perfect humanity and our paradise in anticipation of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the state of bliss into which humanity, when perfected, will be brought. At a certain, however remote, date universal wreck will be the end. Nor has the promise of perfection by evolution, such as another school of thinkers holds out, any advantage in this respect over the promise of perfection by effort. Evolution, like effort, comes at last to naught. That death is the renewing of the species and apparently indispensable to progress, might be a satisfactory reflection if the species were everything and the individual were nothing. But the individual is something in his own eyes. Against any scientific theory that human organisms are simply vehicles for the transmission of life the consciousness of each organism protests and rebels.

Still less can any substitute for our hope of a personal immortality be found in demonstrations of the indefeasible vitality of protoplasm. The hope which we resign is personal. Protoplastic vitality is not. Life more or less active may, as these comforters tell us, pervade all things; and in that sense we may continue to live after our dissolution and absorption into the general frame of nature. But what is the value of a life of which we shall not be individually conscious? There may be life in the fermentation of a dunghill. But who can imagine himself blest in the prospect of sharing it?

Of death and of the perpetual renewal of the race the necessity is obvious so far as the present estate of man is concerned. Upon the succession of generations man's conjugal and parental character, among other things, depends. The existence of an undying man would be that of one of Swift's Struldbrugs infinitely prolonged.

John Stuart Mill, in a passage of his essay on "Immortality," highly lauded by Fitzjames Stephen, admits the possibility of conceiving that thought may continue to exist without a material brain, the relation of the two being no metaphysical necessity, but simply a constant coexistence within the limits of observation. Even if we suppose thought to embrace life, feeling, and affection, the mere admission that its disembodied existence is conceivable would be but cold comfort. Mill himself seems to fall back on the enjoyment of the present life exalted by the religion of humanity and ending in what he calls "eternal rest." "If," he says in his essay on "The Utility of Religion," "the Religion of Humanity were as sedulously cultivated as the supernatural religions are, . . . all who had received the customary amount of moral cultivation would up to the hour of death live ideally in the life of those who are to follow them." What is the religion of Humanity? How can there be a religion without a God? How can

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we worship a generalization which cannot hear prayer or hymn, which is not even complete, since the history of man is unfinished, and of which, to enhance the anomaly, the worshipper himself is a part? Is the religion of Humanity anything more than a fervid philanthropy which must probably be confined to a few choice natures and, so far as it involves self-sacrifice, is not likely to be increased by the conviction that the philanthropist, in giving up present good, gives up all? What again is ideal life but unreal life? What is unreal life but death? To Mill it appears probable that after a length of time different in different persons they would have had enough of existence and would gladly lie down to take their eternal rest. Death is not rest; it is destruction. When we lay ourselves down to rest it is with the prospect of waking again refreshed and invigorated to new life. A Greek poet spoke to the heart when he tearfully contrasted the lot of man with that of the flowers of the field which renew their growth at the return of spring, while man with all his bravery and wisdom, once laid in his dark and narrow bed, sleeps a sleep which knows no waking. Yet it is not the extinction of bravery and wisdom that most moves our pity for ourselves. This the next generation may repair. The torch of science is handed on, and the discovery half made by one man of science is completed, when he is gone, by a successor. It is the perpetual slaughter of affection that touches us most, and that, we should think, would most touch the Power in whose hands we are, if in its nature there is any affinity to mortal love. Affection, at all events without the survival of the personalities, must die for ever.

The mere existence of a desire in man to prolong his being, even if it were universal, can afford little assurance that the desire will be fulfilled. Of desires that will never be fulfilled man's whole estate is lamentably full. If to each of us his own little being is inexpressibly dear, so is its own little being to the insect, which nevertheless is crushed without remorse and without hope of a future existence.

It is sad that man should perish, and perish just when he has reached his prime. This seems like cruel wastefulness in nature. But is not nature full of waste? Butler rather philosophically finds an analogy to the waste of souls in the waste of seeds. He might have found one in the destruction of geological races, in the redundancy of animal life, which involves elimination by wholesale slaughter, in the multitude of children brought into the world only to die. The deaths of children, of which a large number appear inevitable, seem to present an insurmountable stumbling-block to any optimism which holds that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nature can never be guilty of waste even in regard to the highest of her works. Waste there evidently is in nature both animate and inanimate, and to an enormous extent if our intelligence tells us true. The earth is full of waste places as well as of blind agencies of destruction, such as earthquakes, volcanic fires, and floods, while her satellite appears to be nothing but waste.

Can we rest on the presumption that for all suffering, at least for all unmerited suffering here, supreme justice must have provided compensation hereafter? Is there not an infinity of suffering among animals? Are not many of them by the very constitution of nature doomed as the prey of animals to suffer agonies of fear and at last a painful death? Are not others fated to be tortured by parasites? Yet where will be their compensation? Where will be the compensation of the hapless dog which writhes beneath the knife of the vivisector, and which not only is innocent but is an involuntary benefactor of humanity?

That a survey of nature drives us to one of two conclusions, either to the conclusion that Benevolence is not omnipotent or to the conclusion that Omnipotence is not, in our acceptation of the term, purely benevolent, has been proved with a superfluity of logic. What may be behind the veil we cannot tell. But in that which is manifested to us there seems to be nothing that can warrant us in looking for immortality as the certain gift of unlimited benevolence invested with unlimited power.

Yet man shrinks from annihilation. If he were certified of it, in spite of all that science or criticism has done to prepare him for disenchantment, and notwithstanding the complacent talk of philosophers about "eternal rest," his whole being would receive a shock. A fearful light would be thrown on the misery and degradation of which the world is full, has always been full, and is likely long to remain full. A fearful light would be thrown on all the horrors of history. The sufferers of the past at all events derived no comfort amidst famine, plague, massacre, and torture, from these theories of an "ideal life," of a "Religion of Humanity," and of a "posthumous and subjective existence in the progress of the species." A selfish tyrant like Louis XIV. or Napoleon would on this supposition—at least while his fortune lasted—have been of all men the happiest, while the victims of his selfish ambition or rapine, slaughtered in his profligate wars, perishing of hunger through his extravagance, or worked to death as slaves in his galleys, would have been of all men the most unhappy.

Is there any voice in our nature which distinctly tells us that death

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is not the end? If there is, there seems to be no reason why we should not listen to it, even though its message may be incapable of verification such as in regard to a material hypothesis is required by physical science. That the intelligence of our five senses, of which science is the systematized record, is exhaustive, we have, it must once more be said, no apparent ground for assuming; the probability seems to be the other way; it seems likely that our senses, mere nerves even if completely evolved, are imperfect monitors, and that we may be living in a universe of which we really know as little as the mole—which no doubt seems to itself to perceive everything that is perceptible—knows of the world of sight. Now, there does seem to be a voice in every man which, if he will listen to it, tells him that his account is not closed at death. The good man, however unfortunate he may have been, and even though he may not have found integrity profitable, feels at the end of life a satisfaction in his past and an assurance that in the sum of things he will find that he has chosen aright. The most obdurately wicked man, however his wickedness may have prospered, will probably wish when he comes to die that he had lived the life of the righteous. It may be possible to explain the sanctions or warnings of conscience generally as the influence of human opinion reflected in the individual mind, transmitted perhaps by inheritance and accumulated in transmission. But such an explanation will hardly cover the case of death-bed self-approbation or remorse. There seems to be no reason why we should not trust the normal indications of our moral nature as well as the normal indications of our bodily sense; and against the belief that the greatest benefactors and the greatest enemies of mankind rot at last in the same grave our moral nature vehemently rebels.

Not much, it is to be feared, is to be gained in regard to this or to any other question respecting man's estate by taking mystical or transcendental views of the moral law. Kant said that the two things which most impressed him with awe were the starry heavens and the moral law. He assumed, as systems of moral philosophy in general assume, that the moral law is one, the fiat of a single authority, or the embodiment of a single principle. There are rules which we must observe to enable us individually to preserve our bodily health and strength, to enable us to earn our bread, and to keep our affections warm and pure for the enjoyment of social and domestic happiness. There are rules which we must observe as domestic beings for the regulation of our families. There are general rules of mutual help and forbear-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ance which we must observe toward our fellow passengers through this life, and the better to secure the observance of which states and communities of various kinds are formed. But these rules seem to be no more identical with each other than is the care for our own comfort in travelling with due respect for the convenience of our fellow travellers. There is a close connection, no doubt, domesticity and sociability being attributes of our individual selves; but not an identity such as would warrant us in speaking of these rules together as "the moral law," and referring them all to a single principle, natural or above nature. Nor is there anything which transcends our being in this world, which is not bounded by and capable of resolution into the needs of our present state, or necessarily points to an existence beyond.

It may conceivably be otherwise with Character, which, formed and manifested by acting in conformity with the rules of our present estate, yet has value and beauty of its own, so that we can contemplate it, mark its improvement or deterioration in ourselves, and make its improvement the object of distinct and conscious effort. In fact, what we call "spiritual life" seems to be the cultivation of character carried on by a sort of inner self. The value and beauty of character, if anything in us, may be thought to transcend the necessities of our present state and to be transferable, so to speak, to a wider sphere. It is conceivable that they may be prized by the soul of the universe, if the universe has a soul, as kindred and capable of being united to itself. That a power of good akin to human goodness is manifested in the universe and predominates over evil, none but extreme pessimists have yet denied. In affection, beauty, melody, and everything that appeals to sentiment, there are intimations of tenderness as well as goodness. It seems at least possible that the destiny of character may not be confined to earth. At the same time, so far as we can discern, character can be formed only by effort, which implies something against which to strive; so that without evil, or what appears to us evil, character could not be formed. For aught we know, effort, or something which we can only describe as effort, not fiat or mere evolution, may be the law of the universe. It is true that the immortality to which any suggestion of this kind points would be of the conditional kind, since good character only could have a life-giving affinity to the power of good.

All arguments of this kind of course have relation to the natural aspect of things apart from revelation. He who, with Dr. Salmond, believes that he has a divine revelation in the Gospel, and a pledge of immortality in union with Christ, can stand in no need of further

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

assurance otherwise than in the way of corroboration. He discusses the natural evidences, like Butler, with revelation in reserve.

There are those who think they display their good sense in bidding us give up these speculations,—which, they say, are beyond the range of our understandings,—and cultivate our pleasure and happiness in the present world. One element of our pleasure and happiness is the gratification of curiosity on the highest subjects. Our curiosity has been or is being gratified as to the origin of our species, and surely the destiny of our species is a question which is not less interesting, while it is inevitably set on foot by the other. However, pleasure and happiness are different things. Pleasure may be felt by the condemned convict in eating his last meal. But happiness seems to imply the sense of security and permanence. Grant that the estate of man upon this earth may in course of time be vastly improved. So much seems to be promised by the recent achievements of science whose advance is in geometrical progression, each discovery giving birth to several more. Increase of health and extension of life by sanitary, dietetic, and gymnastic improvement; increase of wealth by invention and of leisure by the substitution of machinery for labor; more equal distribution of wealth with its comforts and refinements; diffusion of knowledge; political improvement; elevation of the domestic affections and social sentiments; unification of mankind, and elimination of war through ascendancy of reason over passion—all these things may be carried to an indefinite extent, and may produce what in comparison with the present estate of man may be called a terrestrial paradise.

True, all progress is not improvement, nor is the horizon clear of cloud. Overgrowth of population is a danger which the anti-Malthusian can no longer set at naught, and to check which it is certain that Providence will not interpose. Art and poetry do not seem likely to advance with the ascendancy of severe science. There is some truth in the saying of the poet that a glory has passed away from the earth. A glory has certainly passed away from the Moon,—once Diana's bow, the Queen of heaven, the cynosure of love, now a volcanic refuse-heap. However, let us suppose the most chimerical of Utopias realized in a commonwealth of man. Mortal life prolonged to any conceivable extent is but a span. Still over every festal board in the community of terrestrial bliss will be cast the shadow of approaching death; and the sweeter life becomes, the more bitter death will be. The more bitter it will be at least to the ordinary man, and the number of philosophers like John Stuart Mill is small. GOLDWIN SMITH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRESIDENT ANGELL'S QUARTER-CENTENNIAL.

THE recent celebration by the University of Michigan of the completion of twenty-five years of service by its President is a noteworthy event. When we remember that the Semi-Centennial of the founding of the University was observed only nine years ago, we are at once made to realize how large a factor President Angell's administration has been in the history of the leading State university of our country. In this article it is my purpose to characterize the chief features of this administration, and incidentally to glance at some of the problems that remain still to be solved in adjusting and organizing our higher education with reference to the demands of our times.

The history of the University of Michigan must always be one of paramount interest to the student of higher education, from the very fact that its policy and character have so largely shaped the origin and growth of all the universities of the West and of the Pacific Slope. Many of the newer universities and colleges of our country, whether of State or of private endowment, both East and West, have modelled in no small degree their curricula of studies, their organization and methods of work, after those tested and approved by the University of Michigan. That this University has in many ways been a pioneer and reformer, as well as a conservator of what has been proved to be best in the past, is due in no small measure to the cautious yet wide-awake, progressive and liberal yet conservative and conscientious, spirit of the man who for so many years has guided its onward course.

Probably no man could have been found who was better suited, both by native endowment and training, to wear the mantle so ably borne by his predecessors in office—Presidents Tappan and Haven—than was Mr. Angell. His training for the presidency of this vigorous young State university was an exceptionally fortunate one. He had occupied for six years the chair of modern languages in Brown University, his *alma mater*. This experience gave him the teacher's and the scholar's point of view. Later, as editor of the Providence "Journal," he acquired that facility and grace of expression that have made him a master of the *ars loquendi*, and that wide acquaintance with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

national affairs and public men and life that has made him tactful and alert in administration, wise in counsel, and skilful in diplomacy. Then came the initial stage of his presidential experience as the head of the University of Vermont. During his five years' administration, that institution received an impulse that has not yet spent its force.

When James B. Angell assumed, in 1871, the presidency of the University of Michigan, he found himself at the head of an institution that had cherished high ideals and large hopes. The University had not yet fully recovered from the shock it had received from the ruthless dismissal of its first great President, Henry P. Tappan. The majority of the *alumni* were still predicting disastrous results from this action, in spite of the wise and conciliatory policy of President Haven. The University stood at the parting of the ways. The earlier hopes and aspirations must now be rekindled, or else the future of the University was to be eclipsed by its past.

In his Inaugural Address, President Angell foreshadowed the beneficent results of his administration. He recognized first and foremost the relation of the University to the State, both as its ward and as the controller of its destiny. No truer words have ever been spoken concerning the demands the State may justly make upon its University than these:—

> "The State, as the great patron and protector of the University, has a right to ask that it do the best work possible with the means at its command, that with enlarged resources its activity and usefulness be increased, that it do not become the refuge of dawdling *dilettanti* or of curious pedants. It may fairly demand that the University do not, as some institutions have done, when they have waxed strong and rich, shut itself off from living sympathy and contact with the great body of honest, toiling men who help to sustain it, but that it show in the lives of its graduates how its culture enriches and strengthens and adorns the whole life of the State, that it make it plainly manifest to each intelligent citizen that every appropriation to the University sows seeds in the most fruitful of all soils, and swells that rich harvest of intellectual force and manly character which is the greatest treasure and highest glory of any commonwealth."

This idea that the University is the school of the common people is one that Mr. Angell has frequently emphasized in his public addresses.

What, on the other hand, the University has a right to expect from the State, has not been left unsaid. Repeated pleas for more endowment by the State have not been made in vain. Up to 1873, the University, aside from its original grant from the General Government, which yielded about $38,000, was dependent for its resources solely upon special appropriations made by the legislature, and upon the fees

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of students. But in the year just named the legislature voted one twentieth of a mill tax, which produced $31,000 the first year. In 1874 the total income of the University was $145,209, of which $20,210 came from the fees of students. The legislature had still to provide for special objects, particularly for new buildings. In order to secure permanence of policy and definiteness of plan running through a series of years, it was essential that the University should have a fixed and definite income, which could be reckoned with in all plans for future development. This plea was made so effective that in 1893 the legislature increased its fixed appropriation from one twentieth to one sixth of a mill, which yields at present an income of about $188,000 per annum. In the last fiscal year the total income of the University was $440,146, of which $141,888 came from students' fees.

The expenditures of the University have kept fully abreast of its income, and this is not surprising when it is noted that, as compared with twenty-five years ago, the number of students has increased from 1,200 to 3,000; the University has added four new departments to its organization, and has increased its staff of instruction nearly fivefold. That during this period the gifts to the University have been so small has doubtless been largely due to a widely prevailing opinion that the State is bound to care for its own, and that therefore to give endowments to the University is simply to make benefactions to the State. But the question may well be asked whether the largest generosity that can reasonably be expected from the State is likely to supply in the future the ever-growing and multifarious wants of a great university. Has the limit of State support been practically reached, and if so, are public-spirited citizens and friends of education likely to make State universities the objects of their munificence? Upon the answer to this question depends the future of the State universities.

When President Angell entered upon the duties of his office, there were two ideas that had just been incorporated into the life of the institution and were receiving their first practical test,—coeducation and the diploma system of admission. The first woman entered one year before Mr. Angell became President. That coeducation has long ago passed out of the experimental stage in the University of Michigan is generally believed, though there may be some reasons for holding that it has entered upon a new phase of trial. No administration could well have been more generous and fair toward this innovation than that which we are passing in review. In reading the President's Annual Reports, one finds more frequent reference to this than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to any other one feature of the life of the University. In his very first Report, we find the President saying:—

"Hardly one of the many embarrassments which some feared has confronted us. The young women have addressed themselves to their work with great zeal and have shown themselves quite capable of meeting the demands of severe studies as successfully as their classmates of the other sex. They receive no favors and desire none."

This opinion was expressed when there were but 64 women in attendance. In 1893, twenty-one years later, the number of women had increased to 614, constituting nearly 23 per cent of the total number of students, and we find the President expressing his views as follows:—

"The educational, intellectual, and social consequences of this forward movement in the training of women we may not be able to foresee fully, but that they must be very important no one can doubt. I cannot but think that they will be very beneficent. The success of women in all branches of university study and the wise use which they are making of their attainments in life are fast overcoming the objections long held to offering them the opportunities of higher education, while the experience of the institutions which are educating men and women together is rapidly conquering the theoretical objections to the coeducation of the sexes."

The so-called "diploma system," by which the University admits graduates of approved high schools without examination, was inaugurated by Prof. Henry S. Frieze, while temporarily discharging the duties of the presidency. From the first, this plan of bringing the University into organic relation with the secondary education of the State met with President Angell's hearty approval; and the work of preparing teachers for the secondary schools has long been an important function of the University. As early as 1874, Mr. Angell called attention to the desirability of having some instruction given in pedagogy to those who were preparing themselves to teach. In 1879 the chair of the Science and Art of Teaching was established, the first professorship of its kind in this country. This example has been copied by many of the leading universities of our country, including Harvard, whose authorities were at first skeptical about the usefulness of such a chair.

About the same time, other important innovations were introduced. One of these is what is known as the credit system of graduation. It was felt that undue importance had been given to the element of time in fixing the requirements for graduation. Under the four-year plan of undergraduate study, the best men do not have the highest stimu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lus presented to them to do their best work. It seemed to the Faculty that, by taking proper precautions to prevent mere cramming, students might wisely be allowed to do as much work as they could do well, and that each student should be recommended for his degree whenever he had completed the work required for it. The practical result of this arrangement has been to enable the stronger students to complete their undergraduate work in three years and one semester—a few have done it in three years—and to give such students the opportunity of gaining time for their professional studies. In recent years, an arrangement has been made by which students who look forward to medical and law courses in this University, can gain a year toward the attainment of their academic and professional degrees, by double registration during their Senior year. This has become possible only by the expansion of the elective system, which had been introduced, however, long before. Under this system, opportunity was afforded in all the courses, save the Engineering, to elect some study in every semester, and in the Junior and Senior years,—the prescribed courses having been completed,—to choose such studies as would naturally lead up to courses in the Medical and Law Schools. In this way this University has been trying to solve the problem, now coming more and more to the front, how a student who is planning for a course of professional study can cut short his undergraduate course with least injury to himself and to the interests of higher education. Upon the general question of reducing the undergraduate course to three years, President Angell remarks in his Report for 1890:—

> "We cannot neglect to consider what would be the effect of such action on education in the West. Without assuming too much for ourselves, we can hardly doubt that if we made the proposed change, our example would compel the smaller colleges in this region and probably tend to bring all the State universities in the West to make the change also. One who is familiar with the range of work now generally done in the western colleges and universities can hardly think that it would be beneficial to the West to reduce the standard of graduation by a year's study, at least until the requirements for admission are considerably raised."

That other steps are likely to be taken to bring the professional schools into closer relation with the academic department, and to give a certain unity and coherence to the work of the University as a whole, is part of a movement toward realizing the ideals of a true university.

In looking over the Reports of the President, we are constantly reminded that these high ideals have never been lost sight of. We call

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to mind his pleas for the expansion of the higher side of university work, which culminated in the establishment of a graduate school four years ago. While the number of students actually enrolled in the graduate school is not large, the presence of even a small body of graduates engaged in research and investigation is a wholesome stimulus to the entire University, teachers as well as students. In connection with this higher work done in the graduate school, it is proper to call attention to the courses of advanced study organized after the plan of the German seminar, a plan first introduced as early as 1871 by President Adams of Wisconsin University, then professor of history, and open to undergraduate students who have made special attainments. On several occasions Mr. Angell discusses the character and function of a true university, and expresses the desire that the colleges of the State might affiliate themselves with the University, and enter their students at the close of their third year for advanced courses in literature and science as well as for professional study; and that the high schools might relieve the University of the work of the first two years, which is so largely disciplinary. That this desire is utterly vain, we certainly cannot say. At any rate, when we reflect upon the strides in secondary education made in the last two decades, we may well hope that some day our strongest high schools will carry their pupils through all the gymnasial courses now commonly laid down in the first two years of the ordinary college curriculum.

While these changes and advancements have been brought about in the Department of Literature, Science, and the Arts, no less marked innovations and improvements have characterized the life of the professional schools during the period of this administration. In the Medical Department especially the standards of instruction and graduation have been notably raised. Before 1875 there was no examination for admission to this Department. The Harvard Medical School did not require an examination for admission before 1877, and Dartmouth and Bowdoin followed Harvard. Prior to 1877 the medical course ran through two terms of six months each, but in that year the terms were lengthened to nine months. In 1880 another year was added to the course. In 1890 the plan to increase the required term of study to four years was adopted. Meanwhile the entrance requirements had been raised, until they were substantially equivalent to those required for admission to the scientific course in American colleges. The instruction has been taking on a more genuinely scientific character. The laboratories have supplanted the lectures of the old type. In

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spite of these advanced requirements, or perhaps rather because of them, the attendance has increased.

Almost as marked has been the advancement made in the Law School. Until recently, the sole requirements for admission were that a student should be at least eighteen years old and that he should bring a certificate of good character. The instruction was given by lectures, the course running through six months for two years. In 1883 the course was lengthened to two terms of nine months each. During the present year, a class has for the first time entered upon a three-years' course. Similar advancements have been made in the Schools of Homœopathy, Dentistry, and Pharmacy. The most recent step looking toward specialization and better articulation of work has been the separate organization of all the Engineering courses—Civil, Electrical, and Mechanical—into one School.

The progress of the University during President Angell's administration has been not only in the multiplication of departments, in the raising of standards of graduation, and in the increase of facilities of instruction, but also in the growth of what may be termed the true university spirit,—a spirit that disdains mere pedantry and loves learning for its own sake, and that seeks to slough off the puerile manners and barbarous customs that sometimes disgrace American college life. The President's kind yet firm bearing, quiet and unostentatious manner, and genuine and high character have impressed themselves upon the life of the student community, making it wholesome and free from pretence. A devout member of the Congregational Church, and a man of pronounced and positive Christian character, Mr. Angell has ever striven to make the University an institution whose life and influence should tell on the side of religion in its broadest and highest type, wholly free from a narrow and sectarian character. While no man has ever failed to be recommended by him for a chair because of any particular religious affiliations, it is equally true that he has sought for those men whose personal life and character were not only above reproach but promised to be helpful to the student community in the attainment of high ideals. President Angell is the most approachable of men, and while he comes into personal contact with comparatively few of the large body of students, no one fails soon to know the familiar form that may be seen passing in a jaunty kind of way to and fro on his daily walks, or hesitates to seek, in case of need, the sound advice of this wise and gracious counsellor. Aside from his duties as President, Mr. Angell has lectured regularly on international

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

law and the history of treaties and diplomacy, subjects on which he has become a recognized authority.

There are few positions in public life that call for so much wisdom and patience as the presidency of one of our great universities. That the cares and perplexities of such an office are not diminished in the case of one who presides over a State university will easily be granted. How skilfully Mr. Angell has avoided friction, how wisely he has sought to win public confidence in the University, how tactfully he has secured its well-being in times of grave crisis, are matters of history that are or ought to be known to every citizen of Michigan.

In educational circles it has often been a matter of comment that the Faculties of the University of Michigan have been remarkably free from internal strife. That this spirit of concord and peace has been greatly fostered by the genial temper and tactful guidance of President Angell will not be questioned.

The reputation of Mr. Angell is not limited by his work as an educator. Three times during the period under review has the National Government called him into its service. First, to perform the delicate task of reconstructing the Burlingame Treaty with China; later, as Commissioner to assist in settling the fisheries dispute with Canada and Great Britain; while at this moment he is a member of the Deep Waterways Commission recently appointed by President Cleveland. His knowledge of the history of treaties and international law, together with his well-known sagacity as a diplomatist, have made his counsels in all international affairs invaluable.

It is given to but few men to serve such high interests for so long a time. He who has done so with the signal success and loyal devotion that have characterized the service of President Angell deserves well of his country, and is entitled to the gratitude of all who appreciate the worth of a university to the State.

Entitled though he is, in view of the discharge of "duties beautifully done" for so many years, to the unvexed enjoyments that belong to an Emeritus, President Angell still possesses so large a share of *vis vitæ* as to warrant the hope that he will place the University and its patrons under increasing obligations by prolonging his wise and happy administration.

MARTIN L. D'OOGE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MOLTKE AND HIS GENERALSHIP.

WHEN in the year 1858 the then Chief of the Prussian General Staff, General von Reyher, of the cavalry, died, there was keen excitement among great numbers of people as to who was to be his successor in that important and responsible post.

General von Reyher had possessed the confidence of the whole army. He was a self-made man in the fullest sense of the word. The son of a parish clerk in a small town in the province of Brandenburg, he was drawn as a recruit at the beginning of the century, and entered an infantry regiment quartered at Berlin. Being able to write a good hand, he soon found employment in the office of the general who commanded the regiment, who got so fond of him that he even gave him the *entrée* into his family circle. After the catastrophe of 1806–7, Reyher was transferred to the cavalry, taking part in the ill-starred raid of the gallant Colonel von Schill, which ended in the annihilation of his troops. He was then transferred as sergeant to a Uhlan regiment, whose commander was that smart officer, Colonel von Katzler, afterward so celebrated as the leader of York's advance-guard in the war of Liberation. Reyher's whole personality—the reliability of his character, his devotion to duty, the complete success with which his endeavors were crowned—all contributed toward supplying the social and educational deficiencies of his early life, and won for him increased respect and favor in his new position. The officers were very anxious to see him one of themselves—an almost unheard-of thing, in those days, with a man of his antecedents. Every effort was made to facilitate the realization of this wish, and when, not long after, he passed the literary examination in brilliant style, Katzler soon made him his orderly officer. He was thus placed when war broke out in 1813, which furnished him with the fullest opportunities for gaining ample military experience; and, distinguishing himself conspicuously, before long he was transferred to a larger field as officer of the General Staff, in which capacity he served through the remainder of the campaign from 1813 to 1815, and laid the foundation of his great reputation. After the war was over he rose from rank to rank, till the son of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Brandenburg parish clerk reached one of the highest posts in the army.

And so, when his death became known, the question of a successor to this brilliant and distinguished soldier was talked of on every hand. The choice lay with him who was destined to be the first kaiser of the restored German Empire, and it fell on Major-General Helmuth von Moltke. By this choice William I showed for the first time the sagacity and knowledge of men for which he was so remarkable—qualities which, throughout his glorious reign, always enabled him to put the right man in the right place, at least as regards the chief adviser of the crown.

Moltke too had to overcome many difficulties from early youth. In his young manhood his constitution was not robust; his position was an embarrassing one, while the transfer of his services from the Danish to the Prussian crown left him unknown and without patrons. But his iron will and indomitable energy perfected him in his military duties, while, by studying the classics and by carefully observing all that came within his mental purview, he had laid in an ample store of knowledge, and in both those spheres had so equipped himself that a happy application of his acquirements could not fail to ensure him success. This was all the more certain because he had kept himself under strict discipline, continually endeavoring to develop his natural gifts of character, and by so doing perfecting himself for the life-work that lay before him. He was a fresh instance of the truism that the talents and qualities inherent in a man can only develop into genius when they go hand in hand with an untiring love of, and power for, work.

The further progress of Moltke is well-known. In a comparatively short time his ability was rewarded by his transfer to the General Staff, which, as is well-known, is the *élite* of the Prussian army. Only conspicuous ability and personal merit, such as hold out the prospect of developing into a skilful commander or a useful colleague in the work of the higher officials, receive a place in that body, and that only after a long training and probation; but, when once obtained, it carries with it the prospect of speedy promotion, and a precious opportunity of self-devolopment by employment in various fields.

And so it was in the case of Moltke. By his mission to Turkey, during the struggle between the Sultan and the Egyptians, he received his first important military experience, being present at the disastrous battle on the Nisilo; and his prolonged sojourn in Italy helped mate-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rially to develop his powers. Not only did his insight into the course of great events in the world's history, and the time spent on the sacred classical soil, stand him in good stead, but he found time to perfect himself in many ways, more particularly by engaging in historical and geographical studies, and collecting considerable topographical materials. Later on he was promoted to a higher rank in the General Staff at home, where he came in contact with the Prince of Prussia, who thus became intimately acquainted with him, and on whom his conspicuous ability and great qualities made such a favorable impression that he considered him the fittest person to entrust with the vacant post of Chief of the General Staff. How Moltke justified the confidence placed in him, and the hopes based on it, is known to the world.

At the time of his appointment Moltke was in his fifty-eighth year. In regard to his personal appearance, what struck one was his tall, slender figure and elastic movements; and still more his classical features and clear, well-opened eyes. In society he showed great reserve, which led to his being called "the great silent man," and it was only among a very small circle that he took a lively part in conversation; but when he did so, he could be very entertaining, his talk being at once interesting, stimulating, and instructive without ostentation. Full of inexhaustible energy, he had, as time went on, so hardened himself, that he was an untiring pedestrian and an enthusiastic rider. As regards the inner man, the most striking characteristic was heartfelt devotion and attachment to the service of his sovereign and master, which constantly found expression both in word and in deed. His ambition was not of the heaven-storming order, but aimed only at filling his post to the utmost of his power, with true devotion and strict attention to his duty. Of almost Spartan simplicity and unpretentiousness, he always put the cause above the person, and thought far more of the best interests of his king and country than of any fame that might be won for himself.

Let me add here a few little anecdotes in illustration of what I have said of him. One morning, at Versailles, in January, 1871, the letters from home were being looked through while he was present. In one of them was a long poem in his honor, full of all imaginable eulogies, such phrases as "the sage orderer of battles," "the great silent man," etc., constantly occurring. He sat quiet while this great composition was being read out, and when it was over he smiled calmly to himself and remarked to us, "Well, you know, if we had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not conquered, the poem would have begun with the words, 'Thou old fool.'" On another occasion he undertook an official journey to the court of one of the smaller German states. His reception there was most hearty and cordial, and it was in high delight that the general took leave of his princely entertainers after dinner. As he went down the staircase, he suddenly paused, and said to one of his aides-de-camp, "Really, how very forgetful I am! I ought to have worn the prince's order to-day," to which the officer addressed replied, "I should have taken the liberty of drawing your excellency's attention to the fact, but it has not yet been conferred on you, and so you are not entitled to wear it." Thereupon Moltke looked at him gratefully, and said, highly pleased, "Really, really! I am glad to hear you say so. I was afraid I had been guilty of an impoliteness."

When he entered upon his duties as Chief of the Staff, Moltke was but little known to the army, nor did he become so till his capacity was proved by the institution of autumn manœuvres on a large scale, and still more by his conduct of the tours, for purposes of instruction, made by the General Staff,—in both of which cases it was most conspicuous. In the inauguration of these military tours and intricate problems and movements, his great aim was to promote the general efficiency of the Staff, and also the training of aspirants to that coveted position; and these tactical problems were highly appreciated by the army, owing to the admirable solutions of them given by himself. But for the time being the majority of the people had no idea to what extent he gave promise of proving the most judicious adviser of his royal commander in the field; only a very few of the uninitiated knew with what foresight he had reckoned up possible warlike entanglements from the first, or the thoroughness and deep insight with which he worked out all details relating to such a war, should it come to pass. His influence made itself felt, however, in the conduct of the war against Denmark; but the world-wide fame which afterward came to him had its foundations laid securely for the first time in 1866, when his ability was fully and decisively demonstrated by his exploits as Chief of the Staff of the whole Prussian army.

His foresight was signally vindicated at the outbreak of the Franco-German war. It was commonly reported that one day—in July, 1870—an officer came into Moltke's study and said to him, "Your excellency, the relations seem to be growing so strained that it might be well to begin preparations for a war with France." "Do you think things are so bad as all that? Well, then, kindly open that bureau

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there, and pull out drawer number four on the right-hand side, and you will find all that has to be seen to ready cut and dried." Even if this story be not literally true, at least it is quite correct as regards the gist of it. Everything relative to such a war had indeed long before been weighed, and worked out, and decided, and all the necessary orders lay ready to the smallest detail, requiring only the addition of the date for immediate dispatch.

What General von Moltke thought about the duties of the General Staff with regard to preparation for war may be gathered from one of his own printed utterances. He says in the book published by the General Staff on the campaigns of 1870 and 1871:—

"It is among the duties of the General Staff in peace time to arrange the massing and transport of the necessary bodies of troops for *all* probable eventualities that war may bring with it, and to work out the same in full, and to have the plans in readiness beforehand. When an army first takes the field, the most varied political and geographical considerations have to be weighed, as well as the merely military. Mistakes in the original concentration of the armies employed can hardly be redeemed in the whole course of the campaign. All these arrangements may be made long beforehand, and if the troops are prepared for war, and the transport properly organized, they cannot fail to lead to the desired result."

In accordance with the opinion here expressed, the Prussian Staff had long before made all preparations for a war with France, for ever since France in 1866, after the victory of Prussia over Austria, had begun to talk of "compensation," it was merely a question of time as to how long it would be before the French hankerings after the left bank of the Rhine would culminate in an appeal to arms. What follows the above-quoted expression of Moltke's views is of such importance as showing the ideas of the great strategist with regard to the conduct of war in general, that I feel bound to quote it here. The passage is as follows:—

"The further duty of the strategist—the application in the field of the means already provided, in actual contact with the enemy—is on quite a different footing. Here our will is soon brought face to face with the unfettered will of our antagonist. That will can indeed be hampered, if one is ready to take the initiative in good time and is resolute, but it can be broken down only by actual fighting.

"The material and moral consequences of every considerable engagement are so complex, that they generally place one in a totally different position, and with it a new basis for further movements is laid. No plan of operations can be formed with any certainty until the first encounter with the main body of the enemy has taken place. *Only a layman could fancy that in the course of a*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

campaign he sees the carrying out of a previously conceived plan, complete in all details, and maintained unaltered to the end. No doubt the successful leader will pursue certain great aims, undeterred by the vicissitudes of events, but the ways of attaining them can never be determined with any certainty long beforehand."

These views of the lamented field-marshal are decidedly at variance with those so generally entertained as to the methods he used in the conduct of war. The question has often been raised, "What system did Moltke pursue in strategy?" All are now pretty well agreed in answering it as follows, "His system lay in the maxim, 'March on different lines, and concentrate to strike.'" The question is, of course, wrongly put, for what great commander ever followed any "system of strategy"? And the answer given above is not less wrong in itself, for it expresses no principle, but merely contains one of many conditions without which great bodies of troops cannot possibly be handled, or war on a large scale carried on. Yet this question and the answer to it form such a definite part of the general conception of the subject that we must enter into it at some length here, if we wish to arrive at a clear conception of Moltke's generalship as a whole.

At various periods theoretical speculations have led to the construction of systems of the art of war, and men have thought that in knowing and acting on them lay the right means of conducting war to a successful issue. Nay! even during particular wars, the scene of operations and their conduct have been made the subject of scientifically-concocted theories, as a rule much to the detriment of the men to whom such advice was offered. A system implies settled principles and well-defined rules, and we demand of it, if it is to be practicable, that it should be applicable at least in the majority of cases and tend to the desired result.

But in actual life there is very great variableness even in the elementary conditions. The whole political situation, to begin with, has to be considered, the feelings of other states to be thought of, and, moreover, the extent and nature of the resources at command, the topography of the country, the means of transport, the questions of cost and provisioning, and last, but not least, the intentions and movements of the enemy. In all these respects, where one nation is pitted against another single-handed, the factors to be reckoned with are not always the same, nor can they always be reduced to a hard-and-fast system; but every individual case takes a different shape according to the special circumstances attendant on it. The American

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war of Independence was quite different in its conditions, its aims, and the means at command from the Crimean war, and the Italian war of 1859, in its political objects and in geographical conditions, was in its turn materially different from the Franco-German war of 1870. Moreover, one cannot remodel actual warfare to suit the ideal laws of a theoretical system; reality takes all sorts of varied shapes, and we must take it as it comes, accepting the very heterogeneous details which constitute it.

On the other hand, the principle which forms the basis of one of these so-called "systems" is applicable only in an exceptional case, which is so constituted that one can make use of it with advantage for the nonce. In any case it may be greatly to the profit of one of the contending parties, should circumstances allow it, to mass his whole strength compactly, while the other has to assemble his forces at different points. In this way the former of the two adversaries can advance with all his troops well in hand against the scattered forces of his opponent, and thus fall on them in detail with his whole strength, or at least with a great numerical superiority. But to enjoy this advantage the first thing necessary is, that the natural features of the country through which one advances should admit of the whole force being collected on the one line of advance, while it compels one's opponent to move in comparatively detached bodies, which form a wide arc round one's own line of advance. Thus, for instance, circumstances greatly favored the German army in 1870, because the Bavarian palatinate and the Rhine province afforded them an opportunity for collecting their strength, while the French, owing to the configuration of their frontier and the position of their railway system, were almost forced to advance in two bodies from Metz and Strasburg. The Germans thus found themselves at the beginning of the campaign in possession of "inner lines," and would have reaped the full advantage of such a position—for the French did actually concentrate in the first instance at two different points—had not the enemy at once endeavored to remedy the defect. To accomplish this troops were directed to march from Strasburg and effect a junction with the main body in Lorraine,—but it was too late.

In any case one must take the geographical features of the frontier districts as one finds them, and they do not always fall in with the ideal requirements of the theory of marching on "inner lines." If circumstances militate against a concentration on the frontier, no choice is left but to effect a union of forces farther on, by a series of manœuvres,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

making absolutely sure of being able to concentrate together. Other conditions, it may be remarked, are necessary in order to gain the full advantage which is given by acting with a massed army against scattered forces. The most important of these is the question of roads. The great armies which now-a-days take the field require a great area of ground for their concentration; they are composed of several armies, between which there must always be a certain distance, for they must be brought from the districts where they are quartered by different lines of railway. In most cases these smaller armies will each have its separate objective, which will again lead to their being separated. If the communications between the various bodies of the army which is acting on "inner lines" are defective, while the enemy, though on "outer lines," has a sufficient command of suitably-placed lines of railway, it is within the bounds of possibility for the latter to concentrate more rapidly and thus deprive the former of the advantage of "inner lines."

Let us now examine the relation of Moltke's generalship to the different theories, by a review of the several operations of the war of 1870 taken in their entirety.

The concentration of the whole strength of Germany was planned to take place on the left bank of the Rhine, in the advanced western portions of the Rhine province and the Bavarian palatinate, in case the French dispositions should not make other arrangements necessary,—such as, for instance, an early advance on their part from Strasburg into south Germany, which might have necessitated a partial alteration. From that position we were able to move our whole force, either in a mass or in detached bodies, in any direction, and to advance into the enemy's country by the shortest route. If the French, therefore, massed their troops in two great bodies to the west and south, in Alsace and Lorraine, as might be expected from the position of their lines of railway, and remained for the time in that position, the German leaders would reap all the advantages offered by the command of the "inner lines." If, however, the enemy's troops massed themselves in a westerly direction, say along the Moselle from Thionville to the northern end of the Vosges, the Germans would no longer have any "inner lines," and must take the offensive by a simple advance to their front. Moltke was determined on thus taking the offensive, if necessary, but only when sufficient forces were assembled for carrying it through effectively. It was the only way that held out a prospect of concluding the war speedily, and he was all the more justified in trying

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it, as the German leaders had at their disposal forces which were, at least numerically, considerably superior to those of the enemy. At the same time the plan of concentration, as it was carried out in the event, offered another great advantage. The assembling of the third army under the Crown Prince of Prussia in the southern portion of the palatinate, fronting southward against the troops of Marshal MacMahon which were massing at Strasburg, not only covered the flank of our main body, but also afforded an excellent flank position, from which to advance against a possible incursion of the French from the Upper Rhine into southern Germany, and involve the invading force, without difficulty, in disaster. In this part of the theatre of war the dispositions were accordingly made in accordance with the theory of "flanking positions," which some have in all ages considered the only means of operating "*en règle*." But to ensure its success the general conditions, especially as concern one's opponent, and the topography of the country, must be favorable, for it is not every position which flanks the enemy's line of operations that can be used to flank an advance on his part. On the contrary, the opportunity for taking up such a position under favorable conditions is exceedingly rare.

However thorough may be the preparations made for a concentration, it always requires a certain amount of time to carry out, and the skilful application of the means of transport afforded by the railways will not alone ensure that such great fighting bodies shall reach the place of concentration in perfect readiness to fight and march. From the very nature of the case this can be effected only gradually. If, then, the place of concentration lies near the enemy's frontier, the detraining and assembling of the troops must be covered, which is essential in order to prevent disastrous interference by the enemy. This requirement may be fulfilled in various ways. For instance, the divisions, or, if necessary, army corps, which are quartered in peace time nearest the frontier may be assembled on a peace footing, without waiting for their complements to be filled up by reserves, or for new regiments to be formed out of them, or for the arrival of the horses and wagons necessary to complete the artillery, ammunition columns, ambulances, pontoon trains, etc., to war footing, or for the equipment of the numerous supply trains required in the field, without which no large body of troops can be considered fully equipped. Moltke did not think it advisable to make such a proposal, for it would have put the troops affected by it in the position of not being able to put out their full strength, and would have made their use in further

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

operations a doubtful question—at least for some time. Instead of so doing he adopted a plan which was a part of the much and justly despised "cordon system," but which, nevertheless, was most adapted to the object in view, and gave excellent results. This system, which was often applied in the old wars, consists in protecting a district or carrying on a defensive war by occupying all the roads and important points. It inevitably leads to a great dispersion of forces, so that the enemy, if he attacks at any point in force, can make the whole plan futile. Moltke's proposals for covering the concentration were confined to placing small unsupported detachments at various points on the frontier which were of special importance: by this means he hoped to secure the frontier districts from incursions of the enemy which might interfere materially with the mobilization of the troops quartered in them. His object was attained to the full, and thus only a small portion of our forces were subjected to the inconveniences which attend taking the field straight from quarters, without giving time for the reserves, etc., to come in.

The French adopted another movement, for they at once threw their whole forces on the frontier, and tried to put them on a war footing when they were there. The result was hopeless confusion, which ended in their army being delayed longer before taking the field than would otherwise have been the case. The consequence was that they were attacked on their own territory by the German armies, which had quietly and methodically made their preparations in their own garrisons, before they were fully equipped or their concentration had had time to be completed. Moltke was quite justified in adopting the "cordon system," for he never expected that those small detachments pushed forward on the Sarre could hold out against heavy odds, but intended them mainly for purposes of observation, and to hold in check small bodies of the enemy's troops. His further object—the immediate purpose of his movements—was to find out the enemy and beat them with his whole force. He succeeded in this so far as regards the imperial army, but when the republic continued the struggle, and organized fresh armies, in view of the altered conditions he made another objective the goal of his efforts. This was no longer the mere defeating of the enemy's forces, but the capture of a city, and that city Paris, the key of France. He was not mistaken in his hopes, for with the fall of the capital the war was at an end.

It may be asked why he did not rather set his mind on taking possession of the whole of France, thus becoming master of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

points at which the fresh masses of the enemy gathered and were organized into armies. The answer is simply, that with such a large country as France the means at his disposal were not sufficient both to hold Paris in check and occupy all the provinces as well. But, at the same time, this proves that he did not attain success by following one and the same plan from beginning to end, and that even the military objective changed in accordance with the requirements of the changed conditions. Here again we find no rigid adherence to any fixed principle or system.

But let us turn back to consider the details from the beginning of the operations. They began with a general offensive movement, and that made in an eccentric way, with the main body, the first and second armies, fronting westward, and the third army southward. The result was that no later than the third day the whole affair of the "inner lines" came to nothing, as the southern portion of the enemy's forces also drew off toward the west. Had the French chosen they might, if they had gone about it in the right way, have effected a junction between their two bodies, not indeed on the frontier, but farther back in their own territory. Had they done so, it would have been quite out of the question for the Germans to operate on "inner lines," at any rate in the early days of the campaign. That the German leaders did not attempt to profit by the advantage which such a movement would have given them at the beginning of the war, was due principally to the course which the operations took. The advance of the main body, the first and second armies, was directed against the French main body which lay behind the line of the Moselle and was, in the first instance, *a direct frontal advance*. It was the indecision of the French leaders and their defective dispositions that furnished us with the opportunity of extending our line of operation with the object of cutting off the retreat of the enemy into the interior. The battles of Gravelotte and St. Privat, on August 18, which ended in the shutting up of the enemy's main body in Metz, were fought by us *fronting to the rear*, *i. e.*, without regard to our communications, and with our backs to the interior of France, a venturesome proceeding even for an army numerically superior to its opponent. Thereupon sufficient troops were left before Metz to secure the environment of that fortress. That portion of our forces which did not seem requisite for the purpose (the newly-formed army of the Meuse, under the Crown Prince of Saxony) was set in motion, in conjunction with the third army under the Crown Prince of Prussia, against the remainder of the French regular

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

troops. The advance of both these armies was directed toward Paris, but so soon as it was noticed that such troops as the enemy still had in the field were endeavoring, under MacMahon, to move round our right flank to the relief of Metz, this direction was at once abandoned, and the difficult movement of wheeling to the right carried out by the whole force, a movement which resulted in the surrounding of the enemy at Sedan, and the capture of Napoleon and the army. The campaign had begun by *eccentric attack* on the German side, but here we have the *concentric attack* in its most complete form, so applied as to result in the entire surrounding of the enemy.

After the catastrophe at Sedan, the aim, hitherto pursued, changed, for, as I have already pointed out, the proper objective—the army of the enemy—existed, for the time being, only in detached columns. Accordingly, the taking of Paris now became the object aimed at, and the march on that place was entered upon *in as extended order as possible*, which tended greatly to the sparing of the troops, and made it much easier to supply them. This could be done without danger, as the enemy was nowhere able to oppose us in such force as could not be crushed by any one of the individual columns. Accordingly, the march was made as far as the neighborhood of Paris in detached bodies, without any necessity for caring whether it was possible to concentrate the whole force for united action. Not until they neared Paris did the two armies unite in concerted action in order to environ and isolate that city. For this purpose the various corps, though they were now very close to large bodies of the enemy, had to be placed at such a distance from each other that in case of a battle concentration was out of the question. The conditions thus forced upon us made a reversal of the principle, "March separately, and fight united," indispensable, and the watchword now became, "March separately, and fight separately."

The further conduct of the war proved, owing to the unexpected delay in the fall of Paris and the exceptional exertions made by France to put new bodies of men in the field, a task of extreme difficulty; but, in the main, it was based on one great principle—the simple determination to isolate Paris until it fell, and to check all attempts on the part of the enemy to relieve that city or to cut our communications. Accordingly, all the troops that could be spared, as well as those that were gradually added to those at our disposal by the fall of Metz and Strasburg, were used with that object. In checkmating the attacks of the relieving armies our movements were sometimes *frontal* and *concentric;* at others, *eccentric* or flanking positions were taken up, or com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

munications cut (as in the case of Bourbaki's disaster and flight into Switzerland), according as circumstances permitted of our using this or that means with a fair prospect of success.

This brief survey of the operations of 1870–71 may help, in the first instance, to show the justice of Moltke's saying, quoted at the beginning of this article, that it is impossible, in the exigencies of a campaign, to carry out, complete in all its details, any preconceived systematic line of action, and adhere to it strictly to the end. It is only the assembling of the forces to be employed which can be carried out in accordance with a preconceived plan in all its details. The events which immediately follow cannot be foreseen; the course pursued may change at any moment, and in most cases will do so, as it is the disposition of the enemy and the result of the battles fought that shape the situation. Thus it is labor lost to attempt to propound a system of generalship. The only thing is to realize at each particular moment what the situation really is, and to take measures accordingly. In both of these arts Moltke was a passed master. The principle ascribed to him of "marching separately, and fighting in combination" is no system, but merely a fundamental rule of all strategy, of which there are plenty; still less is it a new system. The vast hordes of the Avars and Huns were forced to march separately for fear of being famished if they did not, yet they fought in a body both at the Lechfeld and the Catalaunian Fields.

But if one is determined to find a ruling principle in Moltke's generalship, it may be traced in its most fitting expression in his favorite maxim, "First weigh and then dare!" ("*Erst wägen, dann wagen!*").

JULIUS VON VERDY DU VERNOIS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED